PUT UP THY SWORD

by

J. H. McLAREN

BISHOP G. M. MATHEWS
MEMORIAL LIBRARY

Library of

The Bonebrake Theological Seminary

Donated from the library of

Bishop G. M. Matthews

172.4

Ma223p

Put Up Thy Sword

A STUDY OF WAR

By

James H. MacLaren

LIBRARY OF
Bonebrake Theological Seminary
13
JX 1953
M3 1900
13,961

Fleming H. Revell Company
CHICAGO : NEW YORK : TORONTO
1900

Copyright 1900 by
Fleming H. Revell Company

To the lovers of Peace, to the haters
of War,
To the true disciples of the Prince of Peace,
and the
Benefactors of the Human Race,
This book is dedicated by the Author.

CONTENTS

	PREFACE	9
I.	BRAIN'S REPLY	15
II.	BRAWN'S REQUEST	18
III.	THE LEADING QUESTION	22
IV.	NECESSITY OF DISCRIMINATION	30
V.	CAUSES OF BRAIN'S GREAT CHANGE	35
VI.	WAR IN THE CONSTITUTION OF NATURE	55
VII.	THE REAL TRUTH	82
VIII.	WAR A CONSTRUCTIVE AGENCY	101
IX.	WAR A DESTRUCTIVE AGENCY	109
X.	EXPANSION	130
XI.	DEVELOPMENT OF THE WAR SYSTEM	138
XII.	THE PROBLEM SIMPLIFIED	146
XIII.	WHERE THE BLAME BELONGS	154
XIV.	THE ULTIMATE TRIBUNAL	181

PREFACE

Militarism is upon the throne. It wears the crown, it sways the scepter. All of the older nations have become subservient to the army. What about the new? Is America following in their train? If the idolizing of military and naval heroes, if the high place which militarism has come to occupy in the thought and life of even the American people, may be taken as signs of the times, then are we patterning after the military-burdened, war-cursed nations of the Old World; and that we shall some time come to groan under the same awful yoke is quite evident, if present tendencies are allowed to go unchecked.

The wonderful receptions—the equals of which have never before been witnessed in America—which have been of late given to the military and naval heroes; the wild enthusiasm of the people—even the Christian people—on account of the bloody victories of war; the swelling pride with which great war-ships and commanders have been described and pictured, and their pictures hung in the most conspicuous places in even Christian homes; the continued preparations for war in time of peace, and the unholy conceit which recent victories have generated in American life, ought to cause every

thoughtful person to pause and enquire, Whither are we tending? America began and has continued her splendid career as a great missionary nation in the broadest and best sense of the term, and so she has continued to prosper and to become a blessing to all other nations, and on account of her Christian beneficence, so generously bestowed upon those in distress, she has been loved and honored by the whole world. But when she also descends from this glorious mission, to which she has been divinely called, to assume the role of a great military power, her doom is sealed.

No war-loving, war-practising nation can ever continue to live. "They that take the sword, shall perish by the sword." War is the universal blunder of the human race; it is the result of misguided energy, false education and a mistaken idea of human greatness. The army is a libel upon our boasted civilization. The navy is a stain upon our seas—a modern plague which turns the waters into blood. Instead of the white wings of peaceful commerce, spreading to bear the blessings of one nation to another, we behold these engines of destruction, grim and terrible, with their war-paint and darkened lights, stealing along like thieves in the night, bearing death and ruin to our fellow men.

The recent victories over Spain have made America drunk with pride, and if present tendencies continue unopposed, the last objects to

be seen upon this planet will be a sword, a canteen, a Krupp gun, and a skeleton.

All of the fabulous expense, the unspeakable cruelty, the indescribable suffering caused by war, is inhumane, unchristian, unnecessary and forever wrong.

When we think of the terrible destruction and the untold miseries which the human race has brought upon itself by reason of this Moloch of war, and when we think of the evils which it is now working, how can a Christian do other than condemn it with all the power of his being?

When we think how the Apostles of the Prince of Peace faced the darkest world with no other weapon than the "sword of the Spirit," and no helmet but the "helmet of salvation": no shield save "the shield of faith," and no power but the invisible power of Jehovah:—a Livingstone in darkest Africa, a Patterson in the Islands of the Pacific, a Paton in the New Hebrides, a Penn in the midst of the American Indians—when we think of their sure defense by day and by night: the marvelous faith which they displayed, through the power that sustained them; how that in the gentleness and all-conquering love of Christ they triumphed; the sad fact that we hide behind the walls of our forts and ironclads, substituting swords, gunboats and dynamite for that power which conquered the old savage world, and turned the dark night

of heathenism into the bright day of Christian civilization, then is the cause of our lack of faith in man and God, the retrenchment of our missions abroad and our increasing paganism at home, not far to seek. Upon the Christian Church, ministry and press, the writer has felt it to be his painful duty to place the larger portion of the blame for the growing popularity and increase of our military system. To lay the blame for recent wars on this or on any administration is unfair.

Many a Christian mother, even to-day, seems to be imbued with the same spirit that thrilled the Spartan mother of old, and sees in militarism the noblest calling and the highest honors for her son. Many a young Achilles in our day is being fed, not on honey and milk, but on bear's marrow and lion's heart. Many a pulpit, instead of giving forth its sweet message of "Peace on earth, good-will to men," instead of holding up the beauty of self-sacrifice in the patient endurance of wrong, and the true glory of non-resistance as taught and practised by the Prince of Peace, thunders forth the thrilling tales of savage war, until some inexperienced, ambitious youth, thrilled by the fascination of a false teaching, and blinded by a false glory, determines within himself—what? "I will be a Christain:" "I will follow in the footsteps of the Prince of Peace, and lay down my life for my fellowmen?" No! No! "I will be a soldier: I

will be clothed with honor and immortal fame: I will lay down my life for the glory which crowns the military hero."

The Christian press is so blackened with powder and reddened with blood that it can scarcely, in strict justice, be called Christian any more. No good man can advocate war who stops to think of its stern reality. When stripped of all its false poetry, and seen in its naked prose, no one cares to see it again. When we think how foreign is this savage war to the spirit and teaching of Jesus, of its demoralizing and devilizing nature, its destructive influences on the union and solidarity of the human race, we cannot see how a Christian can believe, much less engage, in this cruel war.

No one can be a true Christian and an advocate of war: no true Christian can engage in military service: war has no place in the Christian system. Christianity and war cannot dwell together under the same roof: one or the other must be dropped.

It is with the profound conviction that war is the supreme mistake of mankind; that it is, in its very nature, inherently and forever irreconcilable with Christ's teachings; that it is the greatest drawback to the unity, harmony, progress and happiness of the human race; that, more than any other agency, it destroys man's trust in man and faith in God, and, therefore, must be a device of the devil, that the writer

has prepared this course of lectures, which he is well aware are not on the popular side of the question.

In presenting this work the author knows quite well that the ground has all been traversed before by abler and more experienced writers. The form of the discussion however is new to the author. So far he knows, it is original, and therefore may prove of some real benefit to the reader. A large number of authors have been consulted, and the results freely used, due credit for which has been given as far as possible. At the close of the lectures, a partial list of the authors and works consulted and quoted may be found.

Praying that this earnest effort may aid in expunging from the human mind and heart those cursed war sentiments, which have been printed there by centuries of misguided education and false standards of human greatness, I send it forth upon its mission in the name of the Prince of Peace.

THE AUTHOR.

I

BRAIN'S REPLY

My Dear Brawn:—Your letter relative to my recent article in the *Century*, entitled, "Can a Christian Believe in War," is at hand. You ask, "Can it be possible that one whose opinion on this, as on other important subjects, has been for many years regarded as authority, not only with the general public, but in university and military circles as well, should have experienced so sudden and so radical a change, assuming a position entirely contrary to all you have said or written or taught heretofore, utterly unscientific and untenable?" You seem also to express deep anxiety in regard to my mental condition, and fear lest the softening of the heart has been accompanied by the softening of another useful organ which is now yielding fruit after its kind. You wish me to inform you more definitely with regard to the circumstances which have led to this "sudden and radical transformation."

It affords me great pleasure, dear friend, to comply with your request. I am more than pleased with the opportunity of stating, as clearly as I may, some of the reasons that have led to this great change in my thinking—a

change which may indeed seem "radical," but which has not been "sudden," nor the result of "temporary emotion," nor "effeminate affection," nor "mere sentimentality." Neither has it been caused by "a religious revival," as your letter seems to indicate. No, it has not been the result of any or all of these influences, at least in the sense in which you seem to imply. Nor have I been led to make this change through any worldly ambition, nor with the hope of promotion, nor any higher honor whatever as you suggest. In assuming my present position I have certainly nothing to gain and almost everything to lose. This change has come to me through a long and thorough study of the whole intricate, and perplexing problem of war, —of every factor involved in it, and of all the circumstances connected with it.

Of course feelings which prompted such study were in their nature humane, and therefore might be characterized as being "sentimental," "emotional" or "effeminate." But what the uninitiated may say will not avail to affect the conclusions that have been reached in the heat of the conflict; or by one, who, having stood in the front rank, can therefore speak from bitter experience. But it will be impossible to make myself clearly understood in a single letter. To do this may require several letters. If, therefore, you can spare the time and muster the patience to read all that I shall be pleased to

write, I am sure that while I may not succeed in convincing you of the reasonableness of my position, or the impossibility of a Christian taking any other ground, I do feel confident that one so fair-minded and so reasonable as I have always known you to be—ever since we first met as fellow students and class-mates at dear old Yale—will come at least to acknowledge that the stand I have taken is the only right one for me, and that it would be impossible for one who has come to think, feel and believe as I do, to assume any other position and be honest and sincere.

Again thanking you for your letter, and especially for your kind references to me personally (before I become degenerate), I have the honor, dear and good friend, to remain, as ever,

BRAIN.

II

BRAWN'S REQUEST

Dear Brain:—Your generous offer to explain at greater length the process by which you have reached this strange position which you now occupy, and your consent to the publication of the same, is most gratifying to me, and will, I am sure, be welcome news to all of your readers.

Need I inform you that, so far as I am concerned personally, no effort on your part is necessary to convince me of your sincerity in this matter, or to prove that not without the strongest and most convincing reasons to yourself have you undergone such a revolution in your thinking? But others will not be so easily satisfied, and already there is arising a clamor, from those who have heretofore been your friends and admirers, for an explanation. Nor do I need to inform you of what in this age it means for one in your position to take so decided a stand against the whole great military world. Whether you realize it or not, this means not only social ostracism both in military circles and out—loss of social standing, influence, and all that the world holds most precious—but even martyrdom itself.

My most earnest desire for your personal wel-

fare and also for the general good is, that you may be led at once, before we engage further in this discussion, to review the ground over which you have come in order that you may retract, so far as possible, some of those radical statements which you have made, and modify others, so that you may stand in a different light before the people who have been your firm friends and supporters, and to whom you, as well as myself, are so deeply indebted.

How are you going to maintain the position which you have taken, what arguments can you adduce to prove to a practical world that war is in every age and form "the supreme blunder of the human race"? That "it is not and never was a necessity"; that it is at this time "the major crime of all nations that indulge in it"; that it is "contrary alike to nature, reason, Scripture and common sense"; that "war is murder, sanctioned by government," and no Christian can possibly be an advocate of war or a participant in it? Such statements seem to me to be so entirely foreign to the facts in the case, so contrary to the operations of nature, and so out of accord with the principles of human nature and the laws of progress, that the anxiety expressed as to your mental condition was not spoken in jest, and seems yet to be well founded.

To my mind, a wholesale condemnation of war is as useless as it is irrational. I might

seek to prove this assertion from nature and from all of life, for it is being illustrated all around us. But I forbear. I wish first to hear more from you. Your arguments will be appreciated, if they cannot be accepted or approved. Your old friend claims not to be infallible in this or any other subject. What I most desire is the truth; and my interest in your welfare, and my zeal for the best interests of mankind, as expressed in this letter, will surely convince you that I am more anxious to find the truth than I am to outdo my old friend in a controversy, which, from the nature of the case, must prove to be one-sided.

It is not because I am a lover of war, as such, that I feel disposed to defend it. I deplore war in all of its hideous forms. I recognize it only as an indispensable necessity and a part of the constitution of nature. If only war could be banished from the world, nothing would give me greater cause for rejoicing. But as well attempt to banish the law of gravitation or destroy the positive and negative poles. War is here to stay. We had better recognize the fact, and then proceed, as best we can, to reform the system so far as it is possible to do so. Human nature is cruel and conflicting; but our mission is to reform and not to destroy it.

The great good which has been accomplished by means of war, the inestimable blessings which have come to the human race in this way,

is conclusive evidence that it has always been a God-ordained means of accomplishing needed reforms, of staying oppression and accomplishing good results which could not have been realized in any other way. And the wonderful change in the art of warfare, which has kept pace with the advancement of the human race, shows quite plainly that war must continue to change, and conflict at arms to decrease, and finally pass out of existence, with advancing civilization, and in no other way. BRAWN.

III

THE LEADING QUESTION

Dear Brawn:—Your letter reveals still more of the generous heart that I have known in the past, and your earnest wishes in my behalf are highly appreciated, I assure you. I only wish for your sake that it were possible for me to modify, or even retract, much of what I have written, but this is impossible. I am willing to stand alone, if need be, for the defense of what I believe to be the truth, and for the abolition of that system, which, I have become convinced beyond the shadow of a doubt, is the greatest curse the world has known, and the burden most grievous to be borne at the present time.

Your letter shows, however, that we have some things in common. We seem to agree that war is a terrible evil. But you say that it is a "necessary evil." I say that it is not. Here then is an issue.

You admit that war is offensive to your finer feelings, and you deplore the dreadful system, and heartily wish that it might be banished from the world. Here again we agree. But now you say that it is "in the very constitution of nature, animate and inanimate, and must therefore be accepted as a great working force in the world, a force that can

never be dispensed with, a power ordained of God." Here also I must take issue with you. If this is true, we are slaves of a cruel system, which sooner or later will grind us to powder. But it is not true. War, like drunkenness, is a creation of the evil genius of mankind. The present war system is the fruit of an evil spirit which might have been subdued, and eradicated, had it not been stimulated by unworthy ambition and human greed. It is the sad result of false education, false ideas of human greatness, and misdirected energy.

I start, therefore, with a clear, unqualified condemnation of war in every form. I do not admit that it was ever an "indispensable necessity." On the contrary I claim, as I hope to prove, that war is entirely wrong in its nature, wrong in principle, wrong from every point of view, that no straw of argument in its favor can stand unbroken. It never has been and it never will be a necessity. If I were not a Christian, and a disciple of the Prince of Peace, I could still assume my position with good grace upon the broad general basis of humanity. But, as already indicated, I am to discuss this subject from a Christian standpoint.

Can a Christian believe in war? That is the question, and the answer to it must depend upon what is Christ's attitude toward war. Did Christ acknowledge war even as a necessity; did He in any sense lend His approval to war

when He was here on earth? What is the truth of His teaching so far as His recorded words are accessible on this subject? Does He approve of or condemn war? If He were here to-day just what attitude would He take towards our armies and navies, and what would He say about our great system of organized warfare?

If it can be shown that Jesus Christ approved of war while on earth, that His teachings are not opposed to it now, and that if He were here to-day He would still acknowledge it as a necessity for the settlement of differences between men and nations, then my argument falls to the ground; I have no more to say in this matter. For while I might still discuss the subject from other points of view, yet it is on this proposition that my argument must stand or fall. If Jesus believed in war His people may. If He opposed it His people must. We cannot believe in that which He condemns and be His disciples. There must be some source of supreme authority; there must be some standard of absolute right and justice which men are not disposed to question; some "Court of Final Appeal," whose authority will be acknowledged as supreme and final.

Such an authority cannot be created by poor, weak human nature. Even the best representatives of the most advanced nations could not form such a tribunal as I have in mind. Their best efforts would fall short of the high ideal.

Their most impartial conclusions might not meet with entire approval.

We see, therefore, the indispensable necessity of some source of final appeal—an authority which most people are willing to acknowledge as more than human, absolutely just and impartial. Such an authority we find in Christ alone. He meets this universal demand of our human need. Without Him our whole system would be sadly incomplete. The prophecies concerning Him are being literally fulfilled. The government is indeed upon the shoulders of the King, and His name is being called "Wonderful, Councilor, Prince of Peace." In most great departments of thought and genius His authority has already become supreme.

Why should it not be so in the question under discussion, by which all our interests are so naturally affected?

In the realm of art He is supreme—the Madonnas are the fruit of His beautiful words concerning little children, and most all of the master paintings have some phase of Christ's life and teaching for their subject. His mind is supreme in the world of architecture. The most beautiful temples in the world have grown out of His teachings in regard to the Father's house and the Father's abiding presence. Then He is the leading spirit in the world of music. The great oratorios are His words in song. He is the real founder of all colleges, of all benevo-

lent institutions, of all missionary enterprises, and the inspirer and prompter of all reforms. He is head master in the world of literature. John Ruskin, the greatest master of English prose, dedicated his highest talents to an "interpretation of the truth and beauty of Jesus Christ." According to Coleridge, whose many-sided genius in the world of literature has not been equalled, the richest passage in literature is the Beatitudes. According to Dickens, the most effective story ever told is the story of the Prodigal Son. In the judgment of Burke, the most influential political document, on the true relations between man and man, is the Sermon on the Mount; according to one of the world's greatest actors, the most affecting passage in literature is Jesus' invitation "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will give you rest." This being the case, then surely, every professed disciple of His is under the strongest moral obligation to acknowledge Christ's supremacy in every department of life, and Christ's word as final in every important question. However much men may differ in regard to Christ's teaching on certain other subjects, on this, it seems to me, opinion must be one. Whatever else He was when on earth, He was preeminently the Prince of Peace. I am quite well aware that His teaching on this, as on several other subjects, is in spirit rather than in letter. He said nothing directly for or against a war system.

Such was not His method of teaching. He dealt with principles rather than with details, and aimed His heaviest blows at causes rather than results. Sometimes His attitude toward those who came to Him for redress of grievances, or for quick decision on some difficult question, was a surprise to them. As in the case, for example, of the man who said "Master, speak to my brother, that he divide the inheritance with me": or the woman who was discovered in one of the worst acts of sin. In the first instance His answer was a flat refusal. "Man, who made me to be a judge and a divider over you?" But He adds, "Beware of covetousness," thus striking at the root principle of this and all similar disputes, namely, covetousness. In the other case His answer was in the form of a searching test. He decided nothing, but left His wise saying to work out its own decision in the mind and consciences of the woman's accusers.

So likewise on the subject of war He left no positive teaching; He organized no anti-war movement; He made no speeches on the evils of war; He said nothing about the disarma, ment of nations; He spent no time or strength discussing the war system as it then existed. His teaching was of a higher order, it was positive and constructive. He exalted those virtues which ever make for righteousness and peace. He condemned with all His might the spirit of envy, selfishness, retaliation, out of which war springs.

He taught the divinity of forbearance, forgiveness and love. He commanded men to love, not only their friends, but their enemies.

It is true that men sometimes quote Jesus' sayings in defense of war. His words, taken in their bare literalness, may be so misused. But such teachings find no support in a true interpretation of Scripture. We cannot think of so noble a character resorting to force, or lifting the hand to smite His fellow man. The right cheek was to be turned to him who would smite the left. The hungry enemy was not to be thrown to raving beasts, but made an object of hospitality, for only in this way could the evil disposition of men be destroyed and their hearts changed and humanized. And now, after nineteen centuries have passed, He has proven, to the better portion of mankind, that the true hero is not the hero of war, but of peace. Although Jesus never unsheathed a sword, for He had none to unsheath, although He never led an army or spent a single moment in military drill, nevertheless, the bravest generals have laid their laurels down at the feet of the Nazarene. Men like Generals Havelock, Wellington, and Napoleon, seem to have exhausted language in their efforts to declare Jesus Christ the bravest general that ever lived. And the system that bears His name reveals the spirit of the Founder.

Christianity means one great, universal

brotherhood, independent of nationality, class or color. The bond of union is not fleshly, but spiritual and sympathetic. "Whosoever doeth the will of My Father which is in heaven, the same is My brother, and My sister and My mother." The true neighbor is independent of locality, or nationality—meaning the first one whom we meet in trouble. The whole Christian system finds its expression in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of mankind. And this necessitates the union and cooperation of the whole human race.

Under such a system war must be ruled out. There is no place for it. The war system is as foreign to the spirit and teachings of Christ as anything can well be imagined. These two forces, war and Christianity, are inherently and eternally irreconcilable. For the true disciple of Christ, therefore, to believe in such a system is impossible. To break from that which is so entirely opposed to His spirit and teaching is the Christian's plain duty. I go still further and declare that every true Christian must either refuse to do military service, or announce himself no longer a disciple of Christ, but afollower of Moses.

The scourge and curse of war, the indescribable evils which it has wrought (part of which I shall hereafter unfold) ought to convince every thoughtful being that war and Christianity can have no more agreement with one another than light and darkness, or Christ with Belial.

BRAIN.

IV

NECESSITY OF DISCRIMINATION

My Dear Brain:—In all that you have said and quoted with reference to the character of Jesus I heartily concur. In our best efforts to delineate that matchless character, we diminish rather than embellish it. Christ is infinitely grander than all that has been said concerning Him. That the spirit of His teaching is opposed to war I likewise cheerfully admit. But this in itself is not sufficient evidence to sustain the sweeping assertions which you have made. Even if it could be shown beyond doubt, that Christ condemned war as a last resort, and forbade His disciples to do military service, that fact would not be sufficient proof that He intended to have such teachings applied as an unalterable rule to every age place and condition, without exception or discrimination.

But we have your own statement for it that the Master said nothing directly on the subject, and left no positive teaching in regard to it. To my mind, that fact is evidence enough that He intended that men should be guided according to circumstances in this as in many other matters on which He refused to give positive opinions.

Now the fact that war is antagonistic to the spirit of Christ and His teachings is not sufficient reason for our dispensing immediately with the war system. Such an act on the part of any single government would, it seems to me, be an unpardonable crime. Think of a nation stripped of all defense! Think of England, for instance, disposing at once of her great navy and laying down her arms! How those envious nations which surround her would immediately leap from ambush to divide the spoils!

Thus we see how utterly worthless are some of our beautiful theories when we attempt to apply them to practical life.

You declare that Christ's teachings on this subject are not positive, and yet, upon the basis of that teaching, you positively declare that it is the solemn duty of every professed follower of His to refuse to do military service. Now my friend, if He was not positive on this subject, one, at least, of His disciples surely is. If he left no definite teaching concerning it, one, at least, who claims to be His interpreter, seems amply able to supply all that is lacking. I too profess to be one of His disciples. I am glad to be numbered, even as one of the weakest and one of the most unworthy of His followers, and yet I believe in the army and the navy, and also in military service as a binding obligation and therefore a sacred duty. The

chief difference between us on this point seems to be this, that while you are thinking of an ideal world and of an ideal humanity, I am dealing with a real world and with humanity as it exists.

But now, the fact that the spirit of Jesus' teaching is opposed to war is, to me, blessed assurance that war must sometime cease to be. Swords must be beaten into plowshares, and spears into pruning-hooks. Indeed, everything that is contrary to His spirit, everything that makes in any way for the injury of mankind, must cease to exist, for "He must reign until He hath put all enemies under His feet." But that blessed time is in the far future. Between the condition of humanity which Jesus pictured so charmingly, and which He represented so perfectly in His beautiful life and character, and the existing condition, lay many a field of bloody conflict. Such a condition could not come in a single generation. It required many generations, each working out its own hard problems and fighting its own fierce battles.

Of course we must apply Christ's teaching, so far as it is possible to do so, in all of our life. Peace is always best, except when a principle must be sacrificed in order to obtain it. Are not even Christ's rules proven by exceptions? Is it always best to turn the right cheek to the rascal who has smitten the left? Is it always right and best for the thief who has stolen my

coat, that I should hand him over my cloak also? How would the Master answer these questions were He here to-day? How would He answer these questions were He in Chicago? I think He would not give any direct answer to them. He would quite likely unfold some beautiful illustration, and tell some touching story, the purpose of which would be to convince His hearers that gentleness, when possible, is always best; that it will win when retaliation or brute force must utterly fail, but beyond that the Master would not go. He would allow men some latitude for the exercise of their own better judgment.

Under what conditions ought one to show kindness to a burglar—one who would not hesitate to commit murder in order to accomplish his end? Kindness might be in order if he were disarmed and bound in irons; otherwise, cold lead might come under the head of Christian duty. At any rate, this would seem to be the highest act of kindness towards one's wife and children. I am sure that Jesus Himself would admit the validity of this claim. The same principles may be applied to nations. Think of treating the inhuman Spaniard or the unspeakable Turk with anything like Christian kindness! What would our national Christianity count for to-day had we refused to use our force in the relief of the downtrodden Cuban, and to banish Spanish tyranny from the West-

ern Hemisphere? And would it not have spoken volumes for our Christianity, as well as for our humanity, had some Dewey steamed the White Squadron up the Dardanelles, and, at the mouth of our mighty guns, forced that human devil at Constantinople to cease from his wholesale butchery of the poor, defenceless Armenians? Every war-ship that goes on such a mission is a gospel-ship, and every sword drawn in defense of the helpless and oppressed is a sword bathed in heaven.

Talk of doing away with our armies and navies! As well tear down the houses which shelter our heads!

War is not the worst experience known to mankind. War, with all its terrors and all its demoralizing influences, is far more to be desired than peace at the sacrifice of principle. War is a blessing as compared with peace at the expense of suffering and misery of the oppressed. War, at any sacrifice, is a blessing as compared with the demoralizing theory and practise of "peace at any price."

It cannot be denied that war has, in several cases, yielded blessings to mankind which could not have been obtained in any other way. For instance, several of the early Greek and Latin wars, as well as some of our modern conflicts, have resulted in untold blessings to mankind.

BRAWN.

V

CAUSES OF BRAIN'S GREAT CHANGE

Dear Brawn:—Your argument is not without strength, and from your point of view it looks quite reasonable, but it cannot endure the practical test to which it must be subjected.

You say that I am dealing with ideal conditions, etc., while you are concerned with a real world and humanity as we find it. I was certainly not aware of this, and must disclaim all such intention, for it is the stern reality of the thing that has forced me to the position which I now occupy.

But now, your own ideas of Christ and Christianity are somewhat ideal. Christianity, you declare, is a beautiful principle, but capable of being applied only in particular cases. You indicate that where it can be applied, without much difficulty, of course it ought to be, but where it cannot be so applied there must be a resort to force. In other words, the Christian system, according to your theory, is good so far as it goes, but quite often it must be substituted by the Mosaic system.

Suppose, for example, that our missionaries had proceeded upon that basis—of Gospel and sword—war and peace—what progress could

they have made in those heathen kingdoms? Now Christianity is a real power to be applied in a real world and to real conditions. It is not intended as a panacea for moderate ills, but as an actual cure for the worst maladies. It has always proven to be mightier than the sword, and more effective than all the engines of war. There is no case on record where this power has ever been properly applied in either individual or national cases and has failed to accomplish its mission. If this were not so—if it had ever failed at any point, then it could no longer hold its place as the universal system for the guidance and practise of all mankind, or as the real remedy for every human ill, and the true means for the settlement of all differences which exist between men and nations.

But such is its divinely appointed mission—"To destroy the works of the devil"—and short of this it cannot and will not stop. War is a work of the devil, and therefore the destruction of war is one great purpose of Christianity. The power that could conquer the Roman Empire in the days of brute force and bloodshed is not to be limited to special cases in our time, and if only this all-conquering power were given universal application to-day, disarmament of nations might take place at once, and with perfect safety.

I shall not now take the time to examine and reply to the remainder of your arguments in

this part of the subject, as they are likely to be brought up in other connections. I shall endeavor, though briefly, to answer your question as to this cause for the change in my thinking, which you term "radical."

As already stated, it is no sudden change, it is not the result of some passing emotion. There were several steps in the process, and these steps were difficult to take. The path has been thorny and blood-stained. It is not necessary, nor is it possible, that I should trace all of the steps in this hard journey. The final influence, however, which turned me in this direction, came near the close of our Civil War, the burden and heat of which I helped to bear, as you know. Many powerful influences and touching examples had been brought to bear upon me from time to time, but I was too deeply rooted and grounded in my convictions to yield to any or all of these influences. But at least one example came which proved too strong for even a warrior to withstand. To this I yielded because I felt forced to do so. It bent and bowed me to the ground; it broke my heart as well as my stubborn will; it changed the tenor of my whole life and led to this transformation in my thinking. It landed me upon the Rock of Ages, where I now stand, firm and immovable, forever.

I plunged my sword into the heart of a supposed enemy, but lo! he was my friend—the

dearest friend and companion of my boyhood days. Never was there a larger heart or a sweeter disposition! He had performed more acts of kindness toward me and mine than I can now recall. It was to him that I owed my life, for he had, at great risk, rescued me from drowning. He was my stay and support in sickness, and my joy in health. the Hallam of my life and love. We drifted apart in the days of our young manhood, and at the opening of our Civil War I had lost all trace of his whereabouts. But he wandered South and became a Confederate, while I in the North enlisted as a Union soldier, to meet him again in the sad way that I have mentioned.

Alas that I should have become the murderer of my dearest friend! O! that the depths had opened to swallow me ere it became my hard lot to commit this cruel deed, no less dastardly because the Government had placed the stamp of its approval upon it!

When one has slain his dearest friend, it is small comfort to know that he has done so by order of his government, and command of his country. My noble friend knew me; he clasped the hand that had stricken him in death; he looked into my face lovingly, as in the days of yore; he smiled sweetly, as he said: "It is all right, dear old boy; it is the fortune and the curse of war. You have done your sad duty. You have obeyed your ountry's command.

Bear the news to dear old mother. Take her my wages, and the Bible she gave me as I said good-bye at the road gate in front of the apple orchard. Tell her I have come to believe firmly in the teachings of her Book as she taught it to me in childhood; and therefore I will see her in that heaven of which it speaks, where the throb of the war-drum, the burst of shell, the clash of steel and the groans of dying brothers, are heard no more. Take this sword, which has too often been stained with the blood of noble men, whose life it has ended by my hand, and bury it in the depths of the sea. Let it never come again to the light. Oh that I might recall what I have done! How can a Christian obey the Government, that bids him commit murder in its name, and against his will? How can the Christian world sanction this shedding of blood which turns the heart sick to behold? How can a Christian believe in war? How . . ?" his voice grew faint because the life-stream was fast ebbing out. I stooped low to catch his last words, among which were these: "Dear John, promise me that you will do all in your power to rid the world of this curse of war, whose enchanting glitter and false glory have blinded the people to its horrors; promise this and I will die happy. God bless you, dear old friend, and help you in this noble mission to deliver the world from this cur . . ." The last word was never finished. The sweet and

generous spirit had flown to the world of peace, and—O God! How can I bear to say it? By my hand!

Many other cases equally sad come to mind —cases that cannot be reported, things that cannot be told. But this one has had the most to do with the change that has wrought such a revolution in my life and thought.

But I am well aware that even tales of grief will not avail to convince those whose delight is in military service, and whose glory is in war. Therefore, I turn to another phase of the subject, one with which I know you are quite familiar. But I refer to it in order to show you something of its influence upon myself and others who have come to think as I do. Let me recall some of the most appalling wars in history, and let us endeavor to ascertain, so far as possible, whether the causes out of which they come, and the difficulties which they have settled, are at all adequate to their terrible cost in blood, treasure and grief. Here I am quite willing for the time being to waive the leading question, "Can a Christian believe in war?" and to consider this part of the subject simply upon the broad general basis of humanity and common sense. According to the most authentic records since the Christian era began, over five hundred million human beings have perished in war. Since the Trojan conflict, one billion two hundred million human beings have been sacrificed

to the god of war. This ghastly army would form a column twenty-seven abreast long enough to clasp the earth, with a residue of ten similar columns stretching from London all the way to Naples. If this vast army should pass a recruiting point at the rate of one every second, day and night, the last victim would have passed that point in the year 1937.

Let me review briefly some of the leading wars since 1688, and let us endeavor to ascertain whether the causes out of which they have come and the questions which they may have settled have been at all adequate to their awful cost in money, life and sorrow. I will begin with the war of the revolution of France, which was of nine years duration. The cause of this war was the determination of King William to humble the pride of Louis XIV. William of Orange did not have the welfare of the people of England at heart. He desired the throne, but only for his own selfish ends. He longed for the crown, not so much for its own sake as for the power it would give him to carry out his selfish and evil designs. And the degree to which the country indulged him in this is astonishing. For nine long years he went on squandering the resources of his own and other nations as well. He enriched himself to the amount of over one million pounds taken from the soldiers' pay. This cruel war cost in taxes levied at the time, sixteen million pounds, which posterity has had to

pay. It cost the nation, in all, four hundred and eighty million pounds sterling, and eight hundred thousand of its best lives. What was its result? It did not settle anything, but, as is true of most all wars, it led to other and even greater complications which necessitated still other wars.

The War of the Spanish Succession. Queen Anne, seeing how this war of the revolution had crowned King William with glory and humbled his enemy, sought in like manner to crown with glory the Duke of Marlborough. And so followed this awful war which lasted thirteen years (1701 to 1714). It cost the nation thirty million pounds in taxes and thirty-two and one-half millions in loans, and, worst of all, thousands of their bravest lives. Then came the Spanish War and the War of the Austrian Succession, by which the first three Georges imposed upon the country a debt of over twenty-five million pounds.

The Seven Years War was caused by a quibble between England and France over a strip of land on the banks of the Ohio River, which neither of them had any more right to occupy than the Fiji Islanders. Strange as it may seem to us, this war, the result of a mere quarrel over a disputed possession, extended into Europe and developed into a religious war. During this war England is said to have paid to Frederick of Prussia, who was really an infi-

del, six hundred thousand pounds, in order that he might become defender of the Protestant faith. The cost of this war was seventy million pounds in taxes.

The battle of Quebec, which I will only mention, was the result of gross selfishness. It was a contest between England and France for the supremacy of the New Continent.

The French Revolution was even too sad to recall. Its history is too black to unfold. Hundreds of people lay dead and dying in the streets of Paris. According to the testimony of the Countess Von Suttner, who was an eye-witness of the awful tragedy, horse flesh was at a premium, and the flesh of an elephant was distributed in the most meagre allowances.

The good which may have come out of it can never suffice to justify a national crime so terrible.

The American Revolution was a struggle for independence. This awful conflict reached from Lexington, where the first blood of the revolution was shed, to Valley Forge, whose horrors made even the brave Washington weep like a child and pray like an angel. During the five years that the American Revolutionary War continued, two hundred eighty-eight thousand and two hundred Americans enlisted.

The national debt of Great Britain after the revolution of 1688 was only six hundred and sixty-four thousand pounds, but on account of

the American Revolution it increased to the enormous total of six hundred and eighty-five million pounds.

Then followed the French wars, the first lasting from 1793 to 1802, during which time the enormous sum of two hundred and sixty-three and one-half millions was raised in taxes, and two hundred and one-half millions added to the national debt.

During the second French war against Napoleon (1803 to 1815), taxes were levied to the amount of seven hundred seventy and one-half millions, and the national debt increased to three hundred eighty-eight and one-half millions.

Thus it appears that from 1683 to 1815 the Old World experienced sixty-five years of solid warfare, for which the people paid one thousand one hundred and eighty-nine millions of pounds sterling, leaving them with a debt of eight hundred millions, enough, it is said, to build a marble palace for every resident, and support him, and a schoolhouse at the end of every lane.

The loss in human life alone, since authentic history began, by war, is estimated at one thousand four hundred millions of souls, or the entire population of the globe for the past three hundred and thirty years, and we must remember that these were its best men.

The Thirty Years' War was religious. It began as a contest between the Protestant and

Catholic princes of Germany, but it quickly overspread Europe with the swiftness of fire.

The Opium War is one of the darkest blots on England's history. Opium is the curse of China; it is a worse bondage than even drunkenness. Millions of people are held in its awful grasp. Years ago Hudson Taylor said: "I have labored in China over thirty years, and am profoundly convinced that the opium habit does more harm in China in a week than the missionaries do good in a year." Another writer remarks: "It has doomed to death, directly and indirectly, as many men, women and children, as would repopulate London were the whole of its four millions to vacate their homes. Its history is a roll written within and without, a record of lamentation, mourning and woe." This curse was thrust upon China at the mouth of the British cannon, at the point of the British sword. The Emperor of China was urged to legalize the traffic on the ground that he should be permitted to derive a revenue from it. His answer to this evil suggestion was such as ought to make a Christian nation bow its head in shame. "It is true," he said, "I cannot prevent the flowing poison from gaining a foothold in my kingdom. Evil and gainsaying men will for selfish purposes defeat my wishes. But no power on earth will induce me to obtain a revenue by the sins and vices of my people."

Of the second Opium War Mr. Gladstone has

said: "A war more unjust in its nature, a war more calculated to sink this nation in permanent disgrace, I do not know, I have not read of."

The Crimean War: Different causes have been ascribed to this most cruel war. The real cause, however, seems to have been the determination of Russia to rule Turkey, and the decision of France and England to protect Turkey, and so prohibit Russia from controlling the Hellespont. It was indeed a terrible war. Austria and Southern Russia were literally bathed in blood. Harvests and homes, herds and flocks were destroyed, villages were plundered and cities laid in ruins. 309,400 men went to the front; 9,490 were killed in battle, 39,870 wounded, of whom 11,715 died in hospitals; 7,370 died of disease. The total number of deaths was 91,615. The cost of this war was said to have been 350,000,000 pounds. In 1881 English ships brought to the bone factories of England 30,000 skeletons of Turkish and Russian soldiers who had fallen in this cruel war. These were to be used as fertilizing material after being ground to powder in the mills. This unspeakably sad war, with its fabulous cost in treasure and life, is said to have settled no principle and righted no wrong, only led to other and still greater complications.

The Mexican war was caused by a dispute over boundary lines. General Taylor was sent by the president of the United States to seize

the strip of land in dispute, or, to use the words of Grant, "Our troops were sent there to provoke a fight." This was thought by many to have been cowardly on the part of America. In a single day (August 20, 1847), a succession of battles was fought, with heavy losses on both sides, but which resulted in victory each time for the Americans. This war cost $66,000,000!

Then followed our Civil War, the causes and history of which are too well known to need discussion. This war seems to have been for a double purpose, namely, to maintain the Union and free the slaves. The line of battle reached a thousand miles; it lasted some four years, during which time 2,260 fierce battles were fought. It made the South bankrupt and their graveyards as populous as their cities. It left 50,000 widows and 2,000,000 orphan children, and a large army of broken-down men.

In 1866 the United States Provost Marshal reported that 61,362 men on the Union side had been killed in battle, 34,720 died of wounds, 183,287 died of disease; total deaths on one side alone, 298,376. Viewing this sad four years, war, even from the short distance which we have come since then, the question arises in many minds, Might it not have been avoided? Supposing this war had been delayed until the moral force and influence of the North, and of Northern institutions, had been brought to bear

upon the South; or, supposing we should have freed the slaves by purchasing them as England purchased her slaves, at a cost of 20,000,000 pounds paid to slave-holders, even this bloody war, with its tale of horror, in our own dear country, might have been avoided.

The Civil War was followed by the Franco-Prussian War. In 1870 all Europe groaned under the awful scourge. Who has not heard of the siege of Paris, where starvation compelled a great city to surrender, after the world's finest treasures in art and beauty had been destroyed, the Tuileries laid in ruins, and thousands of victims lay dead and dying in the streets. It was then thought, as it has since been shown, that the dispute concerning the possession of Alsace and Lorraine, which was the cause of that dreadful war, was not settled, but was transmitted with all the animosity and hate which it has engendered, to generations unborn.

During this war, from 1870 to 1871, 170,000 French and 1,003,000 Germans took the field. Of the former 41,000 were killed in battle, 36,000 died of wounds, 45,000 died of sickness, 116,000 were in various ways disabled, and 446,000 were taken prisoners. Of the Germans, 19,782 were killed in action, 10,710 died of their wounds, 14,259 of sickness, and 89,000 were disabled! Prisoners taken by the French were very few in number; in all, 684,000 French and 133,750 Germans were killed and disabled.

A loss to the world of 817,751 of its best men!

The cost of maintaining our armies and navies seems to be almost incredible. Sumner estimates that the cost of maintaining a single warship, the Ohio, was sufficient to carry on four institutions like Harvard University. The annual cost of the British army is said to be 17,000,000 pounds, and of the navy, 14,000,000 pounds. The world, even in its peaceful years, sustains 3,700,000 soldiers, at a cost to the taxpayers of $8,000,000 a day. In time of war the armies of European nations can be raised to 9,336,000 men, which means a daily expense of $20,000,000. During the last five months of the Civil War the expense of the government exceeded $3,000,000 a day. The destruction of stores and clothing by both armies during the Civil War is said to have amounted to $100,000,000. The cost of the army and navy during the Civil War was, for 1862, $42,000,000; 1863, $63,000,000; 1864, $88,000,000; in 1885, $120,000,000.

Russia expends 225,000,000 ruples a year on the army, 40,000,000 a year on the navy. The cost of supporting a man in the British navy is 211 pounds a year, in the American navy $1,500 a year. The British navy has 65,000 men, French 54,000, German 16,000, Russian 29,000, Italian 13,000, Spanish 14,000, Turkish 39,000, and the United States 10,000.

The annual cost of the British army is

17,000,000 pounds; of the navy, 14,000,000. The little nation of Belgium spends over 46,000,000 francs a year on the army. A large gun costs $100,000 and will endure only 100 explosions; each explosion costs $1,000.

Up to the year 1876 Krupp had delivered to Europe 15,000 cannon.

The cost of artillery and the value of the guns ruined at the siege of Sebastopol was $12,000,000. The wars of the last seventy years have cost Russia $335,000,000 and 664,000 men. The army of France costs 675,000,000 francs annually, and the navy 29,000,000.*

Can any man, whether he is a Christian or not, believe in this wicked and unjust waste of money, property, time, talent and life? According to the *New York Evening Post* we are now paying each year about $183,000,000 on war which was fought before a majority of our taxpayers were born. The recent war with Spain was waged in the name of suffering humanity. If any war did seem to be justified, surely it was this, and yet, I have no doubt but future history will justify the opinion of those who will dare to believe, and affirm, that even this war might have been avoided. The same purpose could have been accomplished without war and with far bet-

*These estimates have been accumulated from war and other authentic records and authorities as enumerated, so that the author has thought it unnecessary to give all of them in separate references and therefore they are given in this general way.

ter results. We are even now reaping the evil consequences of this war in the Phillipines, where the lives of many of our noblest sons have been sacrificed. The acquisition of this new territory has not only placed a burden upon our shoulders that future generations will have to bear, but it has weakened us as a nation by making us liable to complications with other powers. We may from this war have gained the reputation of being a fighting nation, we have also acquired the unenviable reputation of being a nation of imperialists.

Our nation through boasting has made herself ridiculous in the eyes of the world. We have heard so much about the wonderful extent of our territory, and the inexhaustible nature of our own resources, that it is beginning to appear as though we considered these material things the most precious of all our possessions. The true greatness of an institution consists not in the fine buildings and large endowments, but in the character of her men; and the same is true of a nation. Little Attica, whose capi tal was Athens, has filled the world with her fame for all time. Egypt and Babylon represented the world's wealth and treasure in their day. They had their grand palaces, their beautiful temples, their wonderful walls, pyramids hanging gardens, artificial mountains, and their wealth and resources almost without end. Tyre had her mammoth store-houses, her famous

purple, her coral, balm, jewels, ships, and wonderful merchandise. But none of these flesh-loving, nature-worshiping peoples produced any great poets, philosophers, historians, dramatists, or preachers to give preservation or enduring shape to the inner life of the people. Therefore, what they thought or felt, during the times of their deeper experiences of life, has perished and never can be known.

Greece, on the other hand, was very small as compared with those other nations, and with Rome; but the influence of that little nation, as preserved in the genius of her great sons, can never die. She still has her Apaminondas and her Pericles, her Plato and Aristotle, her Sophocles and Pindar to guard her fame, to interpret her problems of human destiny, and to sing the songs of her glory. She has still her Herodotus and Thucydides, her Demosthenes, her Æschylus, her Apelles and Phidias to record her victories, to proclaim her marvelous achievements, and to give imperishable shape to her highest conception of form and beauty.

How infinitely insignificant seemed little Palestine as compared to those great nations surrounding her—ancient and powerful Egypt, great Babylon, classic Greece and mighty Rome—a poor little province without any army or navy. What hope was there for her? Over against the glare and dazzling splendor of mighty Rome, little Palestine seemed humble

and insignificant indeed. She was shut out from the privileges of the eternal city, it is true, but also from the rottenness and contagion which that city bred and disseminated far and wide. At last, without the aid of army or navy, Rome became the servant of the little despised province whose influence extended through all the staid sober and learned West, and North to the regions of eternal snow. Through all the imaginary and visionary East her armies of righteousness swept on, past the Pillars of Hercules, the sleeping Sphinx on the sand waste of ancient Egypt, along the shores of Hispania, away to the barbarous islands that slumber on the bosom of Southern seas, and with only the sword of the Spirit and the love of God to man, she has conquered the world which she has blessed. Her power is unquestioned, her kingdom is supreme—the kingdom of truth and love and righteousness, which can never, never die. And we also can say: "Thou hast conquered, O Galilean!"

And this is the only kind of greatness that can endure for any nation. Our nation will do well to pattern after it. Unless we learn to realize that greatness which is more than material our doom is sealed. Our nation, with her firecrackers and Fourth of July boasting, has well-nigh brought herself to the verge of ridicule in the eyes of the world, and now the sensational and war-loving elements are declaring

that a great navy and a large standing army will make us a great nation for all time to come. But it is only that patriotism which has stamped itself upon a righteous manhood, and only that love of country which finds its highest and truest expression in the love of all mankind, that shall not perish from the records of the world.

VI

WAR IN THE CONSTITUTION OF NATURE

SANCTIONED BY SCRIPTURE AND HISTORY

My Dear Brain:—For your very interesting production of facts and figures I thank you with profoundest gratitude. Many of the facts are new to me, and will, I am sure, prove to be a revelation to the majority of your readers. I am especially impressed with the amount of labor and self-sacrifice which a true soul is willing to contribute to the cause that lies nearest his heart. I can only wish, for your own and humanity's sake, that you might be able to maintain your position and hold the ground which you have taken. But this you cannot do. It is impossible, as I shall proceed to show you.

The great array of facts and figures which you have produced are not to be ignored nor laughed out of court. I have no disposition either to dispute or call them into question. But I will call attention to the facts that are still deeper, and which figures do not touch at all. It will then be seen quite clearly, I am sure, that the facts cited and the points discussed in your long and faithful, and in many respects able letter, are almost entirely on the

surface of the subject. Therefore I shall endeavor in this reply to take you to the core of the whole matter.

You contend that war is in every form and under every condition wrong, because, as you believe, it is contrary to the spirit and teaching of Jesus Christ; that it would be utterly impossible for Him to admit that such a destructive, inhuman agency ought ever to have been resorted to, and that, therefore, it is equally impossible for a disciple of His to have any sympathy with it.

Although I do not for a moment admit that the teachings of Jesus can be so construed, yet I willingly concede that His teaching seems to furnish good and sufficient ground for such statements. But when you endeavor to compel nature, progress and history to furnish additional evidence for the validity of such assertions, your argument becomes too weak to stand, and so absurd as to become entirely unworthy of the mind that produced it.

We read that "The powers that be are ordained of God." War is certainly one of the powers that be, and has been for centuries. But, according to your theory, it is not a power ordained of God, for you have distinctly declared it to be a device of the devil. Your statement that war is opposed to nature is clearly untrue. I cannot think that you really intended to make such an assertion. It must

have been a mistake on your part. You simply made the assertion and offered not a particle of proof to sustain it. Of course not—for there is none to offer.

In regard to war being opposed to nature—the very opposite is the truth. It is in exact keeping with all the operations of nature, which, "red in tooth and claw," is restless and conflictive to its very heart. In the inanimate realm the struggle for existence is ever in operation. The finest species of plants and flowers and trees are born out of bitter struggle for existence. A thousand have fallen for the one that has stood. And, because they have survived such a struggle, scientists speak of them as being the "fittest" to survive.

In the animal kingdom the struggle is still more apparent, and of still greater interest, because there we are lifted to the realm of intelligence, and here, as if patterning after nature, or even in obedience to its operations, certain animals, as for instance the ants, fight regularly organized battles, and we can discover the existence of conflict still deeper. Inanimate nature has its positive and its negative poles. Everywhere in the universe it is particle against particle and world against world. A chemical solution must have its opposing forces, its positive and negative poles, for only in this way can the desired substance be precipitated. We see this illustrated in the political world also.

What a hard, bitter fight is waged between the two great political parties. The parties and the conflict are alike necessary for the preservation of anything like political honesty, not to mention purity.

Since 1836 eight changes have occurred in the national administration, as follows: in 1840, when General Harrison, the Whig, defeated Martin Van Buren for reelection; in 1844, when Polk defeated Henry Clay; in 1848, when the Whigs came into power under Taylor; in 1852, when the Whig candidate was beaten by General Scott; in 1860, when Lincoln became the first Republican president; in 1884, when Blaine was defeated by Cleveland; in 1888, when Harrison triumphed; and in 1892, when Cleveland was reelected for a second term. Every Congressional election held two years after the new administration came into power, has resulted in a reaction against the successful party, and through this conflict the political life of the nation is preserved.

Another indispensable war is the war of competition which is ever in progress. Radical Socialists and visionary reformers are ever clamoring against it, yet it is the parent of perfection and the greatest incentive to enterprise in the world. It lifts all manufactures upon higher planes because it compels the manufacturer to do his best, or yield the scepter to those who are more competent.

For clearer light on this part of the subject, let me refer you to the able writings of Kidd and Drummond, which, I presume, are in your possession. Mr. Kidd has shown very clearly that all life is a ceaseless conflict; that the bitter struggle for existence cannot be ignored. All life bears evidence of ceaseless progress and development. This development, known as evolution, is the parent of conflict out of which all forms of life are born and only the fittest survive. But, with the advent of man two new forces appear, namely, reason, and the capacity of acting in concert with his fellows in organized society; and therefore progress is a necessity from which there is no escape. The conflict is lifted to higher planes but is no less strenuous than before. In other words, Kidd shows us, as it seems to me beyond question, that conflict and warfare is the method of all nature, and must in some form continue while nature lasts. I do not wonder that the Christian world should have been so impressed with this able work, and that its discovery should have been compared to the discovery of the law of gravitation, and the author to its discoverer.

Mr. Drummond sees the same struggle, although he sees love at the heart of it. Thus he shows in an original and convincing manner that conflict or warfare is not the devilish thing you seem to make it appear. Out of every conflict comes something so beautiful as to sanctify

that conflict, and render it indispensable. The struggle is small as compared with the resultant blessings. So God justifies the means by the end.

Thus the conflict which began with atoms, and is repeated in the vegetable kingdom, dawns to intelligence in the animal world, and reaches its climax in the organized warfare of mankind. Nothing can be plainer, therefore, than the, fact that war is in the very constitution of nature, and that in order to destroy it you must destroy nature herself. Man as a part of nature must therefore fight, not from choice, but of necessity. He is born into the conflict and is a part of it. He simply must struggle for existence or go out of it. In higher, as in lower life, the survival of the fittest is the law of nature and the plan of God.

It is interesting to observe how nature has equipped every one of her creatures, including mankind, with weapons of offense and defense. The humblest insect is armed for the fight. The spider has its secret chamber, the inkfish a dark fluid, which envelops it in obscurity, thus enabling it to escape; the little humming bee can move its wings so rapidly as to become invisible, the seal also has its sensitive fin which quickly detects the approaching enemy. Man is also armed for the battle of life.

God's purpose is the development of the higher from the lower, and the method of that

development and perfection is unending struggle and warfare.

When the selfish and inhuman in our nature predominates it gives us cotton kings with their Haleys and Legrees. When, on the other hand, the sweet little Eva, Uncle Tom, or St. Claire's disposition tips the scale, we obtain noble men and women like Phillips, Garrison, Harriet Beecher Stowe. When cotton outweighs character, the clanging slave-chains make music in the ears of greed, but when national character tips the balance the gun is fired on Sumter and the heart of slavery in this country is broken forever.

If, therefore, Christ is opposed to war in every form, He must be opposed to the whole process of the natural world, for, as we have seen, the world is sustained and operated by means of opposing forces. Human war is the result of these forces carried to their highest degree. It is a part of the great working force of the world.

God is the author of nature, and therefore He is the author of conflict in nature and also in human life. But if the Son of God is opposed to this conflict, opposed to this warfare, how can He be one with the Father? Here seems to arise a strange inconsistency. But you say this does not include organized, human warfare. God does not sanction that, and yet He permits it, and has permitted it through all the centuries until the present time.

If God and Christ are so strongly opposed to war as you claim they are, isn't it strange that it should go on increasing from year to year, and from generation to generation? If war is the business of the devil he must at least be credited with triumphant success.

If the Father and Son are opposed to the war system, their opposition has evidently not availed to check its wonderful growth and the great degree of perfection unto which it has attained. Here is one great enterprise at least for which Satan must be given the credit.

You must see, therefore, that your statement in regard to war being contrary to nature is absurd on the face of it.

And now as to your principal claim, namely, that Jesus is in spirit and teaching opposed to war in every form, and under every condition. Does it not occur to you that Jesus and His teachings are therefore opposed to the operations of nature as described? That God is the author of conflict in nature is a fact which any attempt to deny is worse than useless, and so far as a similar conflict exists in human nature, that conflict must be ascribed to the same author, and must issue from the same source.

But now Christ is opposed to human warfare in every form, and this human warfare is, as we have demonstrated, a part of the same great struggle of which God is the author, therefore, it must follow as a logical conclusion that Christ

is opposed to nature and to the will of nature's God. Here arises a strange inconsistency—a contradiction that would seem incapable of reconciliation. How can He be one with the Father and how could He have been with the Father before the world was? Furthermore, if Christ and the New Testament are opposed to war at all times, then are Christ and the New Testament opposed to the Old Testament teaching and to its author. For, if anything is beyond successful contradiction, surely it is the fact that the Old Testament approves of war, and its God is "the God of battles." For instance: "He teacheth man's hands to war." In Chronicles we read: "There fell down many slain because the war was of God." Such passages in the Old Testament are even too numerous to mention and too plain to be overlooked. God is the God of war; He conquers His enemies with the sword; He brings them into subjection to His will by means of armed forces; He answers the prayers of those whose cause is just, enabling them to triumph over their enemies in the battle, and to rejoice in the victory; He is the Lord of Hosts, who not only sanctions war, but commands and guides it for the accomplishment of His own glorious purposes. He is to rule the nations with a rod of iron. The Revelator says "I saw the heavens opened and behold a white horse; He that sat upon him is called faithful and true, and in His

righteousness doth He judge and make war. And He is clothed in a vesture dipped in blood, and His name is called the Word of God. And out of His mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it He should smite the nations, and He should rule them with a rod of iron. And He treadeth the wine-press of the fierceness, and wrath of Almighty God. And He hath on His vesture and on His thigh a name written, King of Kings and Lord of Lords."

And the New Testament contains a multitude of passages equally strong and convincing. Paul makes numerous well-known references to the visible, material warfare, as an illustration of spiritual warfare which is no less real.

It would not seem, therefore, that he condemned war, or considered it contrary to the mind of Christ, or why should he have so placed his stamp of approval upon it? Also in the words of Jesus Himself we find sanction for war. Did not He declare that there should be "wars and rumors of wars" before the end of time? Again He said: "What king, going to make war against another king, sitteth not down first and consulteth whether he be able with ten thousand to meet him which cometh against him with twenty thousand, or else while the other is yet a great way off he sendeth an embassage and desireth conditions of peace." And did He not declare that He had not come "to bring peace but a sword"?

So far then as the authority of the Scripture is concerned, in both Old and New Testaments, your cause is surely a helpless one. And your sweeping assertion to the effect that all wars in every age, and under every circumstance, have been contrary to the will to God, and an unspeakable curse to mankind, is a direct denial of the Inspired Record, from lid to lid.

How then can I be expected to agree with one who disagrees with God?

In regard to your thorough and interesting resumé of the leading wars of history, especially those that have occured since 1686, I am pleased to say that I have been enabled to survey the matter from another point of view. I now see, as in clearer light, the unspeakable sadness of the fact that so many of the world's wars which you have mentioned should have grown out of the petty jealousies and party strifes of a few corrupt, gainsaying people, whose lot it was to have been born with a crown on their, too often, empty heads. I was not indeed aware of the fact that certain of these wars, arising only out of personal jealousies, had led to intricate complications and to such disastrous results. It certainly reveals the great mistake which any nation makes in placing the power to declare war, even for selfish purposes, in the hands of a few corrupt persons who regard human life simply as "food for gunpowder."

I am as much opposed to such wars, occurring

in such unhallowed ways, as you can possibly be, but not all of the wars which you have cited can be so characterized; there is another side to all of what you have said. Your indignation for those wars which have no foundation in justice or righteousness seems to have prejudiced you against those which have had a righteous cause and have been waged only in the interests of the right and for the defense of downtrodden, suffering humanity.

I will ask you, therefore, to view the subject once more from my point of vision. You have given the dark side of the French Revolution, and on that side you have spoken truly. I can willingly endorse all that you have said and more. But before condemning that revolution, we must study its cause. Revolution is delayed evolution. The French Revolution was, under the circumstances, an inevitable necessity. It was the cloudburst of an overheated, impure atmosphere, which had been gathering for centuries over the peoples' heads and, like a mighty cyclone, it swept along, leaving destruction and death in its pathway. But it also swept away certain terrible evils which could not have been disposed of in any other way. It cleared for all time the atmosphere so heated, so vile, so impure and so unbearable, as only a cyclone of destruction could clear it. It swept away, though in blood and flame, the throne of ancient kings and gave to a long-suffering, persecuted

people "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people." What else but revolution could have come from a nation whose government was so base, and whose rule so cruel and so unbearable, a people who were not allowed to grind their corn except in the seignior's mill, nor to weed their crops, nor manure their lands, lest the game of the nobility should be injured? A nation whose nobility could amuse themselves by shooting carpenters and plumbers for the pleasure of seeing them roll from the roof into the street, or whose bloody hunters could warm their feet in the bowels of their servants, which were actually opened for that purpose.

The French Revolution was not only an inevitable necessity, it was an unspeakable blessing. Of course it did not right all wrongs immediately, and even under Louis XIV., one of the basest of human beings, the people were so cruelly treated that we are led to wonder how such awful cruelties could ever have been inflicted in a nation so near the border-line of civilization. But even the French Revolution was having its desired effect. The writings of Voltaire and Rousseau were wielding such an influence in France as were the works of Edmund Burke in England and Thomas Jefferson in America. And although the French people have not yet made such advancement as to become stable and trustworthy as are the

Anglo-Saxons, the fact is due largely to centuries of bitter persecution and ill-treatment to which they have been subjected. Other wars may be necessary in order to mould them into the temper and character of the more peaceful nations; yet it is quite evident that without the Revolution they never could have attained unto their present condition of liberty, prosperity, equality and happiness.

Neither was the battle of Quebec an unmixed evil. I admit that its motives were selfish and that it was waged for conquest and supremacy, yet it resulted in much good. It overthrew much of the tyrannical rule and despotism which France had set up in the North American Continent, for Quebec was fast becoming a new France where tyranny and despotism of the old France were being repeated. But right across the line there was a New England, whose contrast was a standing rebuke to the tyrannical rule of France and a continual inspiration to its misguided and oppressed neighbors, influencing them to cast off the yoke of bondage which neither they nor their fathers had been able to bear. When we compare Quebec with Boston, the contrast is striking indeed. In Boston a man's home was his own and he was his own master. In Boston they had the town meeting where every citizen could express his opinion and cast his vote upon all public questions. In Quebec this was forbidden, the

citizens could neither vote nor express an opinion contrary to the wishes of his ruler. Thirty years later, however, the parent of all this tyranny and despotism, crime and cruelty was overthrown by the revolution which we have just cited; and although the atrocities and unspeakable crimes may not seem to be justified in the light of subsequent events, yet the blessings which it has yielded, the good which has arisen out of these awful wrongs, will have to be acknowledged with profoundest gratitude.

Nor can I understand the ground of your unqualified opposition to the American Revolution. That conflict was also inevitable from the very nature of the case. America was as unwilling to be domineered by England as by France. She could not tolerate "taxation without representation." Thus it fell to the lot of our country, composed of her thirteen little isolated colonies, to separate herself from the mother country, and so our brave sons of the revolution marched to meet the mighty mistress of the seas. Although this awful conflict reached from Lexington, where the first blood of the revolution was shed, to Valley Forge, whose horrors made the brave Washington weep like a child, pray like an angel and fight like a hero, it resulted in the God of battles turning the tide of conflict against every foreign foe, and the independence and supremacy

of great America was no longer a dream but a glorious reality. "America for Americans" has become the watchword from that day to this, and will be while time and the spirit of freedom shall endure.

Nor did the Mexican War result in evil only. Through this war was gained the territory of California and New Mexico, with undisputed possession of Texas; in all, nearly 100,000,000 square miles.

It also trained great men like Lee, Grant, Sherman and Stonewall Jackson to become leaders in the Civil War which soon followed.

But even the Civil War was not, in your judgment, justified. If ever any war was righteous, surely it was this. The poor negroes were bought and sold and treated more cruelly than were the animals. "In New Orleans" says one, "in 1855, I saw a family almost white, a father, mother and four children, as beautiful a group as I ever beheld, sold to the highest bidder for $2,900. I also saw a woman sold upon the auction-block and commented upon by the auctioneer, amid the laughter of the brutal crowd, as being more valuable because she was a member of the Church of Christ." Such an incident called forth the war poem by Whittier, entitled "The Christian Slave."

"A Christian—going—gone!
Who bids for God's own image; for His grace
Which that poor victim of the market-place
Hath in her suffering won?

"My God! Can such things be!
Hast thou not said that whatsoe'er is done
Unto Thy weakest and Thy humblest one
Is even done to Thee?

* * * * * * *

"But our poor slave in vain
Turns to the Christian shrine his aching eyes;
Its rites will only swell his market price,
And rivet on his chain.

"God of all right! how long
Shall priestly robbers at Thine altar stand,
Lifting in prayer to Thee the bloody hand
And haughty brow of wrong?

"O! from the fields of cane;
From the low rice-swamp; from the trader's cell;
From the black slave-ship's foul and loathsome [hell,
And coffle's weary chain—

"Hoarse, horrible and strong,
Rises to heaven that agonizing cry,
Filling the arches of the hollow sky;
How long, O God, how long!"

It is impossible to see how this war could have been avoided in a country that was one-half slave, and one-half free. It decided that for all time, under the Stars and Stripes, no man can hold property in his brother man. For this reason the Civil War has found justification in the thought of man and God.

Still stranger does it seem that you should declare the Spanish-American War to have been premature, and you claim that future records will show how this war might have been avoided. Yes, had the strong permitted the extermination of the weak; but how can future records ever justify the non-interference of a great, strong nation,

when the weak and helpless were being so outraged at its very door? What respect could we ever hope, as a nation, to receive from others, had we refused to lift the strong arm of power against Spain, and bid her, in the name of our common humanity, to abstain from the cruelties which might have caused even devils to shudder?

Think of the history of Spain in Holland, Mexico and Peru! Think of those terrible outrages described by Motley, which were sanctioned by the fiendish Philip, conducted by the bloodthirsty Alva, and the wolfish Weyler! When certain of our leading peace-loving representatives were sent there to investigate those conditions which were so disturbing our peace, they went with the hope, if possible, of avoiding war, but ere they returned, they thanked heaven for the privilege of resorting even to war. With whitened lips, and aching hearts, and voices trembling with deep emotion, they stood upon the floor of the United States Congress and declared amid breathless silence, broken only by sounds of suppressed grief, that the half had not been told, that war was not only a duty; but, in the interests of suffering humanity, the blessed privilege of our nation. Their speeches were heard with marked attention; tears of sympathy flowed in the galleries amid expressions of righteous indignation. The feeling thus stirred at Washington widened

and deepened until it swept like a tidal wave from sea to sea, and all American citizens rose and stood together as one. There was neither North, South, East nor West, as such. The American standard was lifted and over it was written this motto:

> "Saxon, Dane and Norman are we,
> But we all are one in our love to thee."

The reins were taken completely out of the hands of the President. It was impossible for him longer to delay the declaration of war; he simply became the servant of the people, and was compelled to execute their will. The people said: "We are the power; you are our servant, placed here to execute our will; you must do it"; and he did. And, as there was justice in the cause, so likewise was there glory in the war. It was a most righteous war. Jesus Himself might well have been chaplain on board the Olympia.

Let me give you a description of the Battle of Manila, and in the light of the cause for which it was fought, surely its glory must flash upon your vision.

It is the memorable night of April 23, 1898. Our grand American fleet, composed of the Boston, Baltimore, Concord, Olympia, Petrel and Raleigh, under command of Commodore George Dewey, are lying quietly at anchor in the harbor of Hong Kong. The evening is calm, the night is still, the mighty war-ships

sway gently at anchor upon the bosom of the placid water, and all is well.

All is well, but not for long. The dark war-cloud—grim and foreboding—looms upon the near horizon. The gleam of its destructive lightning is already visible, and the rumble of its awful thunder can be heard in the distance. Alas! Two great nations—Spain and America—have declared themselves to be in a state of war, and our ships must depart from the waters of a neutral power.

But whither can they go? Between them and any friendly port lie leagues of ocean wide. Only one course is open to them. The path is plain—the path of duty—though it leads to death. Our fearless commander will find a friendly port or make one. "Capture or destroy the Spanish fleet" is his order. Why this strange command in the closing years of the nineteenth century under the reign of the Prince of Peace? Not for conquest, certainly, nor yet for worldly glory, nor for the acquisition of dominion, gold, acres, or earthly aggrandizements are the prows of those engines of destruction, grim and terrible, turned toward the barbarous islands of the sea. Theirs is indeed a mission of destruction, but more truly is it a mission of fulfilment and of life.

He who walks the bridge of the stately Olympia, as, like a war-horse she flees bounding over the waves of the sea, is no warrior of the

war-loving type. Child of the Green Mountains of that great and peaceful state, officer in one of her temples of God, and disciple of the Prince of Peace; disciplined, refined and ennobled by the culture which makes her people great, yet strong and brave in the heroism which has made her sons renowned; tender and sympathetic, ever touched and moved with compassion by the pains and griefs of suffering humanity, yet firm and immovable in the right, as those giant hills of his nativity, though clouds may sometimes overshadow, thunders shake, and lightning scorch their summits, still firmly there they stand, erect and immovable, reflecting the beauty of the sunshine, when the clouds have passed away. So rises our hero into world-wide prominence.

> "Like some tall cliff, which lifts its awful form,
> Swells from the vale and midway leaves the storm;
> Though round its base the rolling clouds are spread,
> Eternal sunshine settles on its head."

And why? Because the spirit of Jehovah is upon him, and all who accompany him upon this ever memorable missionary tour. They too are anointed to preach the Gospel to the poor. Not with lips of flesh, or tongues of human speech, but with the clear-cut lips of mighty guns and tongues of searching fire. To open the eyes long blinded by pagan superstition and heathen night, to unstop the ears long deaf to the chimes of modern civilization and progress,

to lead those poor victims from the crime and bondage of Spanish tyranny out into the liberty of children of American freedom and God. Such is the purpose of their awful mission and the motive which prompts it—for no other motive can ever move the American nation to arms.

For this cause our mighty ships of war, with darkened lights, steal along as thieves in the night. They are nearing the island of Corrigedor. It is the hour before the battle, the most trying time in human experience. Over Spanish mines and torpedoes of destruction they glide, for our brave commander fears naught but God.

A quick flash from the top of the island and our heroes know that they are detected by the keen eye of the Spaniard. Still on they glide, brave and dauntless, though now clearly visible in the flame of the McCulloch's blazing smoke-stack. Another clear flash, and the thunder of a mighty gun is heard from the rock El Frailie. It is the enemy's greeting.

A hissing, crashing shell of death passes overhead, when the guns of the Boston, Concord and McCulloch respond to the greeting which is not repeated. On and on towards Cavite our stately ships are gliding, until lo! by the first faint rays of the morning they behold the top-masts of the Spanish fleet!

O Spain, Spain! Thy days of cruelty are

numbered! Thou hast sown the wind and thou shalt reap the whirlwind; the fields of thy bloody sowing are ripe unto the harvest and the sickle of eternal justice is lifted to lay them low! Our hero remembers the story of thy cruelty. He remembers the unspeakable suffering of those perishing ones in Mexico and Peru under the fiendish Philip; he remembers the sad story of brave little Holland under the bloodthirsty Alva; of William the Silent and his noble followers, murdered, tortured and exterminated by the thousands! He remembers the Inquisition, with its tale of horrors; he remembers poor, persecuted Cuba, cursed by Spanish rule under the wolfish Weyler, and, being a "little lower than the angels" he cannot but "remember the Maine."

The visiting ships draw near; the Germans as enemies, the English as friends. The British cruiser, Immortalite, passes close astern of the Olympia; all officers and men are in their places, and the discipline is beautiful to see. Her band is stationed on the quarter-deck, the signal to play is given, and lo! music, sweet and soul-thrilling, floats out upon the waves. Listen! O ye sons of the free! Listen! O great and grateful nation! Listen too, ye narrow, morbid critics; you, who in your depraved natures and benighted intellects will even stoop to despise the mother that nurtured you! Listen now to the music of Britain's

glorious band! Its thrilling strains float over the waves to cheer our heroes in the hour of conflict. Its blessed strains are not unknown; they touch and move each loyal heart. This is the tune they play: "The star-spangled banner in triumph shall wave, O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave," and our heroes are inspired. Again they play: "See the conquering hero comes." Then the command: "Bring out the battle-flags!" is heard, and from every mast and gaff the stars and stripes are waving while British tars cheer and sing.

The screws turn, and our mighty ships of battle bear their heroes to the scene of conflict, with decks all "cleared for action." Fort Luenta speaks out its challenge, which is silenced by the Concord. The morning sunbeams stream over the hills, tingeing the bay with redness and clearly and distinctly revealing the Spanish fleet.

Suddenly the Olympia swings into line of battle, opening fire with her powerful eight-inch guns, and then the Baltimore thunders forth her mighty cannon. One by one the ships swing into line and the command "Open fire with all guns!" is given. Quickly and bravely the foe returns the fire. The awful war-lightning gleams and its deafening thunder rolls. The smoke grows dense. Screaming, bursting shells of death are in the air. The walls of

steel are pierced and laid open to the sea. The mighty armor parts and rolls before our awful fire. The Spanish fleet, on fire, is sinking. The scalding, gurgling water, foaming in its gory redness, swallows the victims in its whirlpool of death and hell.

Our brave men pause to rest and reckon. At 11:20 they resume the fight, and at 12:45 the Spanish flag comes down, the enemy surrenders and the victory is won!

Thanks to our noble Admiral! Thanks to his brave and gallant men! Their names are henceforth inscribed on every loyal American heart.

> Great are the guns of our navy,
> But greater the manhood behind them!

Thanks also to our English brothers, ever brave and true! Thanks for their soul-stirring music and their hearty cheers. We give them our prayers and our love, as the big tears flow hot and fast. Once more have they endeared themselves to their own by ties of blood and love that time and trial may never part. The story of Quebec is repeated. Quebec, where our English and American brothers fought side by side until the French fled, and this great continent was won for free institutions, human liberty and prosperity, such as the world has never seen before. Quebec, where they buried their differences with their dead and pledged eternal friendship to one another. And although

that friendship was temporarily disturbed by the disagreement that sadly came between us, it has never been destroyed. Long since have they come to recognize the justice of our cause and the necessity of our rising in arms against them. It was good for those great nations that they should have been formerly parted in order that years hence they might come together in a more friendly and indissoluble union—and that blessed day has dawned.

Again at Manila has the covenant been renewed—on the water where they all sang and cheered—on the shore where they defended each other and took the oath of brothers in blood. May no yellow press or yellow pulpit or demon from the pit of hell ever avail to disturb our friendship or destroy our peace.

Thus we have come forth from this battle of blood and fire more firmly united than before. We have ceased to cherish any feelings of animosity or hatred born out of the conflicts of the past. Did any such wrong feelings linger in our bosoms, it seems to me that in the white fire of loving sympathy and brotherly feeling, which burned in its molding whiteness at Manila Bay, they must have been burned and purged away, and we welded together so firmly that no power of earth or hell can ever tear us apart. Over the ruins of bloody conflict we entwine our glorious flags—the Stars and Stripes and the Union Jack—and clasp in loving friendship, in

union strong, great and indissoluble proclaiming to the world, that for the best interests of mankind and the glory of God, the lands of Milton, Shakespeare, Macauley, Burke and Browning, Tennyson, Gladstone and Victoria, of Washington, Penn and Lincoln, Holmes, Longfellow and Grant, are one and inseparable forever!

VII

THE REAL TRUTH

Dear Brawn:—The letter which you consider, at certain points, to be "unanswerable," is the least difficult to answer of any that you have written. To many readers it may indeed seem to be unanswerable. But we must always distinguish between apparent and real truth.

The apparent truth is that all nature is fixed and immovable; the real truth shows all nature —every particle of matter in the universe—to be in quivering motion. The apparent truth is that the world is stationary in space, and the sun revolving about it; the real truth is the very opposite. These examples may be applied to your last letter. You certainly are making the most of a weak case. The cause of war has in my friend an able and faithful defender. And now, since you summon all nature, science, Scripture, the universe, and God Himself, to the defense of your argument, it will be necessary for me to reply to you after the order which you have chosen.

First: As to nature. You find the whole natural realm in a state of conflict—"resistless and conflicting to its very heart, particle against particle and world against world"; so do I.

You recognize the same conflict passing up into the vegetable and animal kingdom; and I say it is so. Then you proceed to show that man, as a part of nature, is subject to the same conflict, and must "struggle for existence or go out of it": and again I reply, it is so. But let me inquire whether that conflict, which you discover in nature, is sufficient evidence that men must combine to contend against their fellow men in organized warfare. I claim it is not. Man was born to contend with the whole realm of nature, which is beneath him, but against his brother man—NEVER! This is quite plain from God's Word in the beginning of Genesis: "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth." And unto man in reference to nature, God said "Subdue it":—namely, triumph over all its forces, conquer it; bring it into subjection to thy will; compel it to serve thee. There is the soil, which, if left to itself, in its own natural state, will yield only rank, poisonous weeds, thorns, briars and the like. Subdue it, and it will produce the golden harvest, the precious fruit, trees of many species, flowers of fragrance and beauty.

There is the animal world, wild and ferocious; subdue it, and it will become domestic, helpful,

even companionable. There is the mineral kingdom, the forest and the sea; subdue these and the iron becomes an engine; the hollow log a ship; the water, steam, propelling the ship against the winds, waves and currents of the ocean, which becomes a pathway for the commerce of the world. There is the great electric current that belts the earth, and streams and flashes wild and rampant in the heavens above; subdue it, bring it under thy control, and it becomes thy servant, turning a thousand wheels and spindles, dragging the lighted chariots through the streets, filling the world with energy, enterprise and light. And here is the force of the natural world within us, untamed and powerful; subdue it; put it beneath thy feet; have dominion over it; compel it to become thy servant or thou shalt become its slave. This is God's kind of warfare. Not man against man for the destruction of his kind, but all men unitedly warring against the forces of nature and conquering those forces for the good of mankind.

This is the great discrimination which you have entirely overlooked. Man is created upon a higher plane than all things else. He was created in the image of God, endowed with the mind of God to do the will of God. If then all nature is at war, what of it? Must man contend with fellow man because particle contends against particle, or brute against brute? No! the very opposite is the truth. Man's business

is to "subdue it." Nature may be "red in tooth and claw"; she may be engaged in a brutal struggle for existence, but man stands above all of this by divine appointment. He was crowned king of nature at the creation. Let the great realm of nature contend forever, if it will, but man must live at peace with his fellow man. Our divinely ordained mission is to fight, not against one another, but for one another; to help our brother man, and not to hurt him; to build him up, not to tear him down; to do him good, and not evil. Such is the great, glorious warfare which God ordained, and the only warfare which He sanctions. Any other interpretation of nature, or of God's Word, is contrary to the facts—utterly unscientific and misleading. Here I might rest this part of the case with perfect assurance. The command, "subdue it," settles the case in my judgment. But lest it appear that I have any disposition to pass too lightly over this part of the argument, or to treat with undue consideration that which you have worked out with so much skill, and which you consider unanswerable, I am therefore quite willing to enter with you into a more minute and critical examination of your argument from nature.

I have admitted the fact of a struggle for existence, and for the sake of argument let me say still further that the struggle seems to be brutal, but is this really the case? Is the strug-

gle in nature a brutal struggle, according to the meaning which that term conveys to us? I must deny that it is, and therefore I must furnish reasons for my denial.

You have summoned "two great scientists," as you term them, to your defense. I was not aware, however, that Mr. Kidd was a great scientist. Indeed, I have my doubts as to his being a scientist at all, or at all scientific. Mr. Drummond is, however, a great scientist. This I cheerfully admit.

In summoning Kidd to the witness-stand you weaken your case, but when you call up Drummond you lose it entirely. Kidd you may have and welcome, but Drummond's testimony is all on my side of the case. Your statement that so many of the leading clergymen, as well as teachers, have accepted Kidd's book and have spoken of it with such unqualified, I might say extravagant, approval, is true, but why they have done so I have been puzzled to know. This book, with the exception of those chapters on the influence of Christianity on our Western civilization, Protestantism, and the French Revolution, and on French and English civilization, is a mass of self-contradictions and conflicting statements, from beginning to end. His argument as a whole is erroneous, and many of his statements show that, either language must convey very different meaning to his mind from what it does to most others, or that he is ill-in-

formed upon the subject which he undertakes to discuss.

For instance, when he tells us that science from an early stage in her career has been engaged in a personal quarrel with religions, and seems to have maintained down to the present time that "her only concern with them is to declare that they are without foundation in reason." Such a statement seems utterly untrue, and devoid of reason, so far as true science is concerned. For science to proceed upon such an hypothesis would indeed be absurd from a scientific point of view. The fundamental purpose of science is the discovery and verification of facts. It matters not where those facts are found; it is the true purpose of science to proclaim them. Science proceeds irrespective of form or time-honored custom, and it is at least as much her purpose to reveal and proclaim the truth which she has discovered as it is to expose and condemn the error. His statements, that science has lost sight of the main question as to whether religions have any beneficent purpose to perform in the evolution of society, that men are not interested in the welfare of future generations, but wholly in their own, are untrue. When he tells us that "the intellectual forces of the time were directly opposed to Christianity," the student will wonder how he is going to dispose of Alexandrian philosophy, or Stoicism, which were certainly not directly opposed to

Christianity. He should read Eusebius' "Preparation for the Gospel," and Farrar's "Seekers after God." When he tells us that in the Middle Ages "all attainments of Greek and Roman genius were buried out of sight," the student will be in equal perplexity to know how the author would regard Platonism, the writings of the Schoolmen, also the great system of Roman law. Are not these works of genius?

He condemns science and yet, his method of procedure is somewhat scientific. Religion is exalted although it has no basis in reason. Socialism is condemned as unscientific and contrary to the spirit of civilization, and still something in the form of a beneficent social order is recommended. Men are condemned for being engaged in a continuous struggle for existence and yet the time is hailed with joy when the struggle will be even more intense than before. He says it makes no difference as to the truth or validity of religion provided it serves a purpose in evolution. But another has said: "An evil tree cannot bring forth good fruit." Thus his arguments, however beautiful they may appear on the surface, are based upon a false philosophy. It does seem unfortunate that so many Christian ministers, laymen and teachers should accept and approve of such a work as this and swallow wholesale anything which seems to be a defense of religion against its supposed enemy, science.

I refuse, therefore, to recognize Mr. Kidd's authority on this subject. Turning to Mr. Drummond, however, the contrast is as agreeable as it is striking. He too sees the struggle for existence, but he says something more. There is indeed a strenuous struggle for the life of self, but there is an equally intense struggle for the life of others. To Mr. Drummond all nature reveals itself as the garment of God, woven without seam throughout. There is no disorder, no confusion, no disconnected phenomena and no brutal struggle amid handiwork of the Creator. Self-sacrifice begins where life, which at first is self-centered and self-contained in a single cell, bursts its little prison walls in order that it may produce other lives. Here too love begins love, which was not after-thought, or something which descended out of the clouds, but which was distilled on the earth. We learn from Drummond that the struggle for existence is not brutal and selfish, but vicarious and self-sacrificing. Such testimony changes the whole aspect of the case. We see the natural realm, which you believe to be in warlike conflict, really in harmonious cooperation; particle against particle, mass against mass, world against world indeed, not, however, for the purpose of war but of harmony and peace, every part marvelously adjusted and beautifully balanced for the mutual helpfulness of every other part; every particle acting in its own appointed place,

every world moving upon its appointed journey, obedient to its central sun, no disorder, no conflict, but perfect order, harmony and beauty. And this is the inspiring example of the Creator to the creature. All the movements of mankind should likewise be carried on in the spirit of mutual helpfulness, obedience and therefore peace. So likewise the struggle in nature, termed "brutal," is nothing of the sort; it is also God's example of self-surrender, one life giving itself in behalf of another, one form of life losing itself in order that other and better forms may come forth. And how inspiring it is to follow this process through its various stages until it reaches the realm of consciousness and becomes at last a voluntary act. It dawns to consciousness in the animal kingdom and reaches its highest in the human mother, its complete fulfilment in the Christ. Thus God is making all His great realm of nature say to men: "See, I have given you this example of self-sacrifice; the true desire of all things in nature is not to conquer but to yield in behalf of others—to find life only to lose it again that it may be the more truly found in the being of another." And as this desire continues to increase and to unfold in our experiences, it becomes still more precious and Godlike, until at last it is known as vicarious sacrifice in him who lays down his life for others. And this being the case, war is therefore contrary to the

plan and purpose of God. It must be ruled out entirely. There is no place for war but hell, where it originated and whence it came.

Thus God teaches in nature just what Christ proclaims in Scripture: "He that findeth his life shall lose it and he that loseth his life for My sake shall find it." This is God's law—we are to die for others and not to make others die for us. To do the one is Godlike, to resort to the other is devilish. But whatever interpretation we may feel disposed to place upon nature, Christ taught the survival of the weak and care for the helpless. The man or nation that will not obey and practise this precept of Jesus, must perish.

The arguments which you adduce from Scripture are no less erroneous than those which you have forced from nature. The proof-texts which you have cited prove nothing—nothing is more common than proof-texts. Some persons attempt to establish any kind of a theory by the use of proof-texts. A piece of machinery or a bit of bone have little interest for one by themselves; let us see the entire machine or the perfect skeleton. A single sentence or passage read from a letter would not be accepted as proof in any court of justice; the entire letter must be read for the reason that a sentence isolated or taken from its connection may convey an altogether different idea than in connection with the context. Now the phrases, "God of armies,"

and "God of battles," cannot be sustained only upon the basis of an impossible interpretation of the Bible and a false exegesis.

The God of war which men find in the Bible is not the true Jehovah of the universe, not the Father of light and life and love, not He who binds the sweet influence of the Pleiades. The Old Testament war-god is Mars—Mars the cruel, Mars the bloody, hurling thunderbolts at the enemies of all those who are fortunate enough to be first to solicit his intervention in their behalf as they go forth to slay their enemies. Unto him the cruel Spaniard turns for help as he goes forth to oppress and destroy the helpless Cuban. From him the unspeakable Turk solicits aid to massacre his defenseless neighbor, the Armenian. From him or some similar incantation of evil, men seem to derive inspiration for the purpose of destroying their fellow men.

"Thee to defend the Moloch priest prefers,
The prayer of hate, the bellows to the herd,
That deity, accomplice deity, in the fierce jealousy of wakened wrath,
Will go forth with our armies and our fleets
To scatter the red ruin on their foes!
O, blasphemy! To mingle fiendish deeds with blessedness." *

But the Bible idea of the true God is the exact opposite. He does not aid men in war under any condition whatever; He lends not His sanction nor His aid unto men or nations

* Coleridge. Religious Musings.

who take up arms against their fellow men. He never did. They seek His aid in vain, and have always done so. The belief that God has ever helped men to destroy one another in war is a delusion from the devil.

The passages of Scripture which you quote do not have reference to material warfare. This is wherein the world has long been deceived. For instance (in Eccles. 8: 8) we read: "There is no man that hath power over the Spirit; neither hath he power in the day of death: and there is no discharge in that war." Again in Micah (4:3) we read: "And He shall judge among many people, and rebuke strong nations afar off; and they shall bend their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." James asks (4:1): "From whence came wars and fightings among you? Came they not hence even of your lusts that war in your members?" Paul says (2 Cor. 10:3, 4): "For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh: (for the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds)." 1 Timothy 1:18, Paul instructs young Timothy to "war a good warfare" in faith. He also speaks elsewhere of the "armor of light" and "the helmet of salvation," and so forth. In 2 Cor. 6:7: "By the word of truth, by the power of God, by the armor of righteous-

ness on the right hand and on the left." Eph. 6: 13–17: "Wherefore take unto you the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand. Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breastplate of righteousness; and your feet shod with the preparation of the Gospel of peace; above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked. And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God."

Tacitus declared the invoking of the Deity by the Germans to be a delusion. The polite Roman did not think God present in the fightings of men. Frederick of Prussia declared that he always found the God of battles on the side of the strongest regiments, and when it was proposed to place upon his banner the inscription, "For God and country," he rejected the name "God," declaring it not proper to introduce the name of Deity in the quarrels of men.

Your high approval of the war of competition, because of the great blessings which you say it has yielded, and the high degree of perfection which you say it has produced, is no less astounding than your strongest statement in regard to the war of weapons. To my mind the war of competition is very little more honorable or humane, and it certainly is not Christian.

No Christian can believe in the war of competition which is being waged in the labor world to-day. That competition is a promoter of enterprise, is another only apparent truth—a delusion—another hallucination of moonshine philosophy. The real truth is the exact opposite. The war of competition, as carried on to-day, tends to the destruction of all legitimate enterprise, and the degeneration of society. There is a kind of competition which is always commendable, namely, the struggle to attain unto the ideal—a competition such as we find, for instance, in the world of art; but this noble desire to attain unto the highest degree of perfection that has ever yet been reached, is not to be compared for a moment with the brutal struggle to manufacture and place goods on the market for the lowest possible price. Such a struggle is degrading. It is injurious from every point of view. It cheapens the goods, cheapens the manufacturer, cheapens the labor and the laborer, grinding him down into the earth. It creates such a line of cleavage between the employer and the employe that they have nothing in common. Sympathy is crushed out, all fellow feeling is obliterated, and true manhood degraded and destroyed.

"Competition," says Dr. Walker, "to have the beneficent effect ascribed to it, must be all-pervading and unremitting pressure like the atmosphere which we are unconscious of because it

is all the while within and without us, above and below us. Were the pressure of the atmosphere to be made unequal, its effect would become instantly crushing and destructive; so it is with competition." Speaking of the disastrous results of such competition, the author goes on to say that "every gain which one party makes at the expense of another, furnishes the sinews of war for further aggressions; every loss which one person or class of persons sustains in the competition of industry weakens the capacity for future resistance. This principle applies with increasing force as men sink in the social scale."

In such a struggle the weak must give way to the strong. The same is practically true of monopolies and trusts, as we find them to-day. These are without doubt the evils which should give the American people most cause for alarm. Every monopoly is a Mt. Vesuvius in the industrial world, lifting its dark, threatening summit above the heads of the laboring people, and, indeed, all of the people on the plane beneath it. Any one who has watched the workings of the Standard Oil Company, for example, must see that the American people cannot endure such an injurious private despotism indefinitely. Some twenty-five million dollars income, it is said, must be distributed annually and by one man. This fabulous sum of money must go just where that one man determines, and be

applied to the purposes which he designs.

Every generous gift, for example, made by the head of a leading trust to a great university seems to have been accompanied by a raising of the price of the product of that particular company. This has been repeated so often as to become almost unbearable. The man at the head of this gigantic enterprise claims to be a Christian, but such a conception of Christianity is as far from the teaching of Jesus as the East is from the West.

A recent law suit brought by a business partner against the head of a leading steel trust, reveals still farther a condition of things which may result in untold injury to the American people if it is allowed to continue unchecked. Both of the contending parties admit that, on a formal capital of twenty-five millions, and an actual capital of ten millions, the company had in the year 1899 net profits of twenty-one million dollars, and yet the people were paying at that time nearly twice as much for steel and iron as they were twelve months before.

Professor Ely says: "An examination of our social history reveals the fact that laborers have been guilty of no offense for which they could not find a precedent in the conduct of unprincipled employers. I myself have seen the property of one railroad corporation seized by another without the slightest ground in right or justice." * Unless the Ameri-

* The Labor Movement in America. pp. 164–165.

can people shall rise in their might and scatter this Moloch of monopoly, and destroy this fast increasing evil of trusts, their doom is sealed. They must destroy him or he will destroy them.

A few days before his death President Lincoln spoke prophetically when he said: "Our nation has rid itself of the great evil of slavery at a great cost, but I foresee in the future a greater evil, that will test the nation's life. It is the power of corporate bodies that will seek to dominate the nation's economic policy."

But you ask: "What other power under the sun could have wrought such results as this war of competition has produced?" Another power under the sun has wrought infinitely better results and its success is as far beyond the competition of to-day as peace is beyond war. It is the blessed humane power of cooperation. Wherever properly applied its success has been established and its history is honorable. You seem to indicate that only competition has succeeded. Have you not heard of the great cooperative banking system of Germany, France and Italy? Have you not heard of the great cooperative industries of England and France; the Cheney Silk Works of Connecticut, where employes in most cases remain all their days, and where the employer and employes are one? Have you not heard of the Bon Marché of Paris where ten thousand clerks are their own employers? The success of cooperation thus

far achieved proves that men should work together for each other's prosperity, welfare and happiness. Men and nations are ruining their highest interests and destroying their best life by fighting each other and working against one another. If only they would cooperate, bury their weapons of devilish warfare and go to work in each other's interest, in ten years we would not know it was the same world.

"A man may be a Christian who is a master or a slave, but the logic of Christianity is liberty. A man may be a Christian who is an aristocrat or a plebeian, but the logic of Christianity is democracy. A man may be a Christian who is a capitalist or a wage laborer, but the logic of Christianity is cooperation."* The war of competition acts on the same principle as all other wars, it is disintegrating, destructive and demoralizing in its nature. Peace has the opposite results, and if only the great energy and expense wasted in cruel warfare were turned to the higher, gentler and nobler pursuits of peace, ours would become an infinitely more beautiful world ere long. On this point let Longfellow † speak:

"Were half the power that fills the world with terror,
Were half the wealth bestowed on camps and courts

---

* Washington Gladden: Tools and the Man.

† The Arsenal at Springfield.

Given to redeem the human mind from error,
There were no need of arsenals or forts:
The warrior's name would be a name abhorred,
And every nation that should lift its hand against a
brother,
On its forehead would wear forever the curse of Cain."

VIII

WAR A CONSTRUCTIVE AGENCY

My Dear Brain:— As I finish your last letter I can heartily wish that you had been the creator of the world, for you certainly construct an admirable world, and people it with a class of beings among whom I could never hope to be numbered. That your world and God's world are quite different, however, I am still thoroughly convinced. I would not insist that your picture of the world is any better than the world really is. The finite cannot comprehend the larger plan and purpose of the Infinite. But I am deeply impressed with your interpretation of nature, and although it has not availed to change mine, I am free to say that it has set me to thinking along this line as never before.

I do not believe, however, that your estimate of Mr. Kidd is quite just. I still think he is something of a scientist, and the claim that Drummond is on your side of the question I hope still to disprove. You claim him because he finds love at the heart of all conflicts. I might justly make the same claim, at least in a general way. I find many exhibitions of love in war. You have asked me to give examples of those blessings which have been obtained by

war. I am pleased to do so. War has produced many blessings, as history quite plainly shows. From the overthrow of the Persian Empire by the trained soldiers of Macedonia, down to our last contest at arms, war has wrought a purpose and yielded blessings which could not be obtained in any other possible way. We beheld the wave of barbaric contest sweeping across the Ægean Sea until met and conquered by united Greece, armed in the sacred cause of liberty. Marathon, Salamis, Platæa, Chalon, Attila, Hastings, Waterloo, are names which bespeak the progress of mankind. The overthrow of the Persian Empire, the downfall of Carthage, and the elevation of Rome, were so many stepping-stones in the progress of the human race. It was through the long and bloody conquests of Hannibal that the martial powers of Rome were developed, and the City of the Seven Hills prepared to give to the world the most perfect system of political law and organization which it has ever received. It was war that preserved Greek literature and art against the inroads of Persian satraps, and so caused Greece to shine for all time as the brightest star in the diadem of cultured nations. It was war, under Napoleon, which broke up the petty states of Germany and Italy, swept away an effete feudalism, and so prepared the way for the intellectual and national life of the most scholarly nation. Our own Civil War was a blessing in disguise.

There were latent powers in the South which could not have been called forth in any other way. The selfishness of the North could not have been overcome by any system of arbitration. The differences between North and South were such as could be settled only at the point of the bayonet. This war aroused the finer as well as the coarser feelings. It heightened the sensibilities, it sweetened the songs, it inspired the poets, it intensified the oratory, it gave the people something to think about, and pray over and fight for. It strengthened the ties of love, and gave to life a sweeter meaning in the parting of father from home, lover from loved one. It has given us the beautiful "Memorial Day," with its flowers and songs and tender feelings, the influence of which for good can never die. Had it not been for this war, the South would not have been anything to-day, and the North, through greed for the productions of the South, would have become debauched.

China presents another unanswerable argument. Why is it that the old, staid, solidified empire is only now rousing from the sleep of centuries? Simply because we taught the "Japs" how to fight, and they in turn have instructed the Chinese in the art which they acquired from us. Before the war, China had "no pushee, no pullee," but now she goes right along like—Japan.

How much time has been wasted in discussing the slow progress of the missionaries in the christianizing of China! Of course it was slow —how could it have been otherwise? How can we cultivate the blossom until the rocky soil is changed; why scatter the seed of Christian kindness upon a hard, rocky surface to wither and to die? The fallow ground must first be broken, the red plowshare of conflict must precede or go along with the scattering of the seed of Christian love, the lazy soul must be thrilled by the sound of drum and fife. And I will not be surprised if some of the other nations which are now receiving, at the hands of our missionaries, Christian, at the expense of military, training, may not have to go back and do their work all over again. China presents a sad example of this fact to-day.

And so I believe there is a time in the affairs of men and nations when no other agency can fill the place of war. I therefore recognize it as a divinely appointed means for good, if used and not abused. Only in this way can I understand the meaniug of the Master's words: "I came not to bring peace, but a sword."

The world has at least seven civilizing and humanizing agencies. These are the army, the press, the church, the school, the home, the hearse, and fire. The army and the church must go hand in hand; the Gospel-ship and battle-ship must sail side by side, until they

reach the shores of the better land where the bugle notes and the sound of the approaching enemy are heard no more. International peace conventions are good, but very limited in their influence; they simply indicate the time when armed warfare will ultimately pass away, but nothing more.

The Czar of Russia seems to be the peace-loving monarch of Europe. His highest hope is that he may never have to conduct a war, but his "peace covers an infernal barbarism"; what else but war can puncture the tartar ulcer? Russia and China are pre-eminently the peace-loving empires of the world. Out of such a peace, anarchists and good-for-nothings are created; with war, patriots and philanthropists.

It must not be overlooked that the lowest races are exterminated faster in peace than in war, and that degenerating conditions exist with the lessening of strife. Red Jacket was right when he said: "Our only salvation is in war; with peace the white man will destroy the courage of our young men, and the chastity of our young women; we cannot live together, we shall be destroyed." Thus war clears up the moral atmosphere and rouses the people to higher life and enterprise. Without it our great, intelligent, enterprising nation would soon drop to the level of the Chinese Empire, and fall into the torpid sleep of indifference, until at last we should become another kingdom of Celestials.

You declare war to be wholly disintegrating and destructive in its nature. Let me remind you that it is a uniting and a constructive agency as well. At the close of the Napoleonic wars we were fearful for the future of Europe, as we looked upon her broken and fragmentary condition; but we have since witnessed that wonderful reconstruction which began immediately to follow those wars. We have seen France compelled to relinquish what she had unjustly acquired, Lombardy given back to Austria, with Venice humbled in the dust; Germany receive back her many principalities, Holland and Belgium become a kingdom, Hanover restored to England, Norway annexed to Sweden, Switzerland gradually resume her independence, England restore to France the spoils which she had unjustly taken. We have seen Germany, which in 1815 was broken up into forty distinct sovereignties, grouped under eight names, become united into one grand civilized power. We have seen Italy, from her broken and scattered condition, become united under Victor Immanuel, and Austria and Hungary come together in friendly alliance. We have witnessed the overthrow of slavery in England, although not directly by war, yet likely through fear of it. We have seen China roused from the sleep of centuries by the small, but wonderful, Japan. We have seen the hard shell of Spanish tyranny broken by the guns of

Dewey, releasing from its cramped and corrupt surroundings the beautiful bird of liberty, which is now rising to soar in the pure air of freedom. A hundred years of progress in a hundred days of war.

And through the wars of the past we are now witnessing the blessed union of the Anglo-Saxon peoples, as never before. Who can make a thorough study of the subject without reaching the conclusion that war is a blessing, if it is a curse?

"On the whole we cannot speak of war as in its essence immoral without impeaching the entire method of human progress and the Providence that has ordained it. The capital moral distinction here is not between war and peace, but between war that is righteous and war that is unrighteous. There have been wars that were villainies and wars that were salvations. There have been evils for which no remedy appeared but the sword. Our Puritan Fathers used that remedy in the seventeenth century against absolutism; the Northern States of America used it in the 'sixties against slavery. In both cases Schiller's words apply: 'The world's history is the world's judgment.' In both periods men went to the fields as Christ went to the cross, to offer their blood for a great redemption. And the blood was not shed in vain. Strange and awful is the whole process of human history—a process which we may

not in this life hope wholly to understand. Ours it is to stand always firm to our duty, and for the rest to say in Lessing's solemn, yet hopeful words: 'Advance at Thy imperceptible pace, Eternal Providence! But let me not, because it is imperceptible, despair of Thee! Let me not despair of Thee even if Thy steps should seem to go backwards! It is not true that the shortest line is always the straight one.'"

IX

WAR A DESTRUCTIVE AGENCY

My Dear Brawn:—Your glowing description of war reminds me of the words of that French writer who hailed war as "divine in itself, divine in its consequences, divine in its mysterious glory and seductive attractions, divine in the manner of its declaration, divine in the results obtained, divine in the indefinable force by which its triumph is determined." You have shown to the uttermost from your point of view the blessings which war has yielded and the good which it has done. You have challanged me to prove by actual facts the truth of my assertion, that war is a device of the devil, and forever contrary to the mind of God and the teachings of Jesus. I have purposely avoided painting the darkest side of the war picture, because I do not believe that it makes for our best moral improvement to have those scenes of blood and carnage and destruction laid bare to the gaze of the people. I thought, moreover, that I had stated sufficient facts to establish the proposition which you call into question. Indeed the dark side of war is too horrible to be fully portrayed; its scenes of blood and suffering and misery have never been

pictured too extravagantly—the half has never been told. The Czar of Russia was right when he refused to have a terrible war picture removed from the principal art gallery of Russia, on the ground that its scenes were so awful as to discourage the art of war, and to destroy the inclination of many who had desired to enter the military service. The Czar, after looking upon the picture, which was so objectionable to many, declared that it should not be removed, as it was no exaggeration. He who had been through many conflicts knew too well that it was a faithful portrayal of the awful miseries and the indescribable sufferings of war.

The four points to which I wish to confine myself in this lecture, and those which make it most impossible for a Christian to believe in war, are:

First: Its unspeakable cruelties; Second: Its demoralizing influences; Third: Its absolute unfairness; and, Fourth: Its destructive character.

First: Its unspeakable cruelties. Sumner's description may serve to bring these cruelties in some degree before our minds. He says: *"At Terragona, were six thousand human beings, almost all defenseless men, women and children; gray hairs and infant innocence, attractive youth and wrinkled age, were butchered by the infuriated troops at early night, and the morn-

*True Grandeur of a Nation.

ing sun arose upon a city whose streets and houses were inundated with blood and yet this is called a glorious exploit." And the storming of Badajoz he speaks of as "a shameless rapacity, a brutal intemperance, savage lust, cruelty and murder; shrieks of piteous lamentation, groans, shouts, imprecations, the hissing of fires bursting from the houses, the crashing of doors and windows, and the reports of muskets, used in violence, resounded for two days and nights in the streets of Badajoz. On the third day, when the city was sacked, when the soldiers were exhausted by their own excesses, the tumult rather subsided than was quelled. The wounded men were then looked to, the dead disposed of." Again he says: "What seems more awfully monumental than Salamanca after the long great battle? The ground strewn with fragments of casques and cuirasses was still white with the skeletons of those who fell. What catalogue of horrors more complete than the Russian campaign? At every step is war and this is enough; soldiers black with powder; bayonets bent with the violence of the encounter; the earth plowed with cannon shot; trees torn and mutilated; the dead and dying wounds and agony; fields covered with broken carriages, outstretched horses and mangled bodies; while disease, sad attendant on military suffering, sweeps thousands from the great hospitals, and the multitude of amputated limbs, which there

is no time to destroy, accumulate in bloody heaps, filling the air with corruption. What tongue, what pen, can describe the bloody havoc at Borodino, where, between rise and set of a single sun, one hundred thousand of our fellow men sank to earth dead or wounded? Fifty days after the battle, no less than thirty thousand are found stretched where their last convulsions ended, and the whole plain is strewn with half-buried carcasses of men and horses, intermingled with garments dyed in blood, and bones gnawed by dogs and vultures. Who can follow the French army in its dismal flight, avoiding the spear of the pursuing Cossack only to sink beneath the sharper frost and ice?"

And this is only a small part of our author's description of the horrors of war, into which we cannot enter further. It reminds one of Dr. Franklin's fable of the young angel who was desirous of knowing something of the worlds in space. An elder angel guides him from world to world. He expresses a desire to see earth, and they reach it just as an awful battle is being waged upon the sea. Ships, instead of spreading the white wings of commerce and bearing blessings to mankind, are engaged in deadly conflict, and the sea is red with blood. The young angel turning to his guide, exclaims: "I asked you to show me earth, and you have brought me to a sight of hell."

For an even more appalling description of war given by one who has drained its cup of bitterness to the last drop, I call your attention to that heart-rending story by Countess Von Suttner.* Her father and her brother, and, indeed, nearly all of their ancestors, were imbued with the war spirit. They seemed to find as much wild delight in discussing the thrilling tales of war as did the Spartans of old. The love of war was literally bred in the bone and circulated in the blood. But the actual reality of war began to dawn upon the Countess when she heard her young husband rejoicing in the "dashing, jolly, glorious" war with Sardinia, which would give him another opportunity to go to the front. "Great God," she exclaimed, "that would be terrible! Must you go?" "I hope so," was his reply. "How can you say that, how can you leave your wife and child?" she said. Then for the first time in her life she realized how much dearer was war to the heart of her brilliant young husband than even his sweet young wife, the Countess, and her baby, both of whom he loved with passionate affection. When the ultimatum had been ignored and her young husband was ready to go, the experience was so heart-breaking, that in her agony all of the old-time wonder and glory of the battle-field disappeared, and she could see only the stern reality of brutal

*Ground Arms.

war. When that loved husband fell, her father tried to comfort the young widow with such words as these: "A state and an empire have longer existence than individuals: and for the existence and extension of these the individual must be glad to die." "In war it is proper to kill, to plunder, to destroy. In peace, thank God, we have tender and loving hearts."

A description of that war as conveyed to her by a letter reads somewhat as follows, the view being from a lofty eminence: "The picture is magnificent, giving all the effect without the horrors, and disguising the realities. No flowing blood, no death rattle, nothing but superb effect of line and color. On the roads, long, serpentine marching columns as far as the eye can reach; upon the plains, regiment after regiment of infantry, detachments of cavalry and battalions. Stirring is the picture when on the plains below we watch the onslaught and engagement of two hostile forces, the glitter of arms, the flashing of bayonets, the uniforms of all sorts, excited, prancing horses, all in one mad whirl of action; over this, clouds of dust so thick that at times it veils all within it. At times it rises and we catch a glimpse of the struggling, fighting masses, then, as an accompaniment, echoing through the hills, the roar of artillery, whose every shot means death—death. Yea, and this is something to inspire a battle-song. It is something also for the writer of the

history of his time to have been upon the hilly out-look."

An extract from a letter written by her second husband, Frederick, reads thus: "What I have seen to-day! Nothing but scenes of agony and horror! Why do others bring back from war such fresh and wonderful experiences? They do not attempt in their accounts to stick to truth and nature, but paint scenes story-book fashion, as is deemed heroic; the more horrible, the more indifferently, the more shocking, the more dispassionately the better. Of disapprobation, indignation, rebellion, not a word. Lift up your hearts to God, and your heads against the enemy, hurrah!" and here he pictures scenes too horrible to be related. Moved by the thought that her Frederick is wounded, the Countess goes to the battle-field. The terrible scenes which she relates cannot here be told. The wounded and dying are too numerous to be waited on, wounds are torn open again by the bursting of shells around the sufferers. A hundred wounded, helpless men are quartered in a farmhouse; a shell bursts over it and all are destroyed. Shrieks of despair arise, but all in vain. There is something still more frightful than the battle, and that is the scene after the battle is over. We hear no thunder of cannon, or roar of muskets, or roll of drums, or blasts of trumpets. We hear the gasps and groans of dying men. The trampled earth reeks with

ghastly, shimmering puddles. The villages are laid in ruins and ashes, the trees charred and destroyed, and upon this desolated spot lie thousands and thousands of helpless dead and dying. Not a blossom or a blade of grass is to be seen, only bayonets, knapsacks, clothing, abandoned caissons, and spiked cannon—near the cannon the ground is bloodiest; there lie the largest number of dead and dying. Horses wounded attempt to rise, but fall back in helpless agony; gullies are filled with mangled bodies; battlefield hyenas rob the poor wounded victims, tearing rings from their fingers and jerking boots from the wounded bleeding feet of the sufferers while they are still living. Her vision of the newmade graves and the halfburied multitudes of men with faces half shot off and bowels shot out, no one to hand the dying or wounded even a drink of water to cool their parched lips; the sad sight of the pale, wan emperor, moving at nightfall among the fresh made graves, with heart breaking at the loss of his noble youth, as he seemed to be saying to himself: "It might have been avoided; without my consent it could not have been. O God! Why did I ever give my consent to this!" is agonizing.

And so the sad scenes move before our vision until son and husband are dead and in their graves. Then is the old father's heart broken also and he dies with the curse of war upon his lips. The scene shifts to Paris where she be-

comes an eye-witness to still more terrible scenes. Hundreds lie dead and dying in the streets; horseflesh is at a premium, and a favorite elephant is slaughtered and sold at an exorbitant price by the pound and by the ounce. And the saddest of all is the fact that these most cruel wars were thrust upon the helpless people to satisfy the selfish, fiendish ambition of a few designing, cruel, heartless people—brutes in human form.

Let me recall the words of Channing:* "By war we understand the resort of nations to force, violence, and the most dreaded methods of destruction and devastation. In war the strength, skill, courage and resources of a whole people are concentrated for the infliction of pain and death. The bowels of the earth are exploded, the most active elements combined, the resources of art and nature exhausted to increase the power of man in destroying his fellow creatures. Would you learn what destruction man, when thus aided, can spread around him? Look then at that extensive region, desolated, overspread with ruins; its forests rent, as if blasted by lightning; its villages prostrated, as if by an earthquake; its fields barren, as if swept by storms. Not long ago the sun shone on no happier spot, but ravaging armies plowed over it; war frowned upon it; and its fruitfulness and happiness have fled. Her thousands

*Channing's Works.

and tens of thousands were gathered from distant provinces, not to embrace as brethren, but to renounce the tie of brotherhood; and thousands in the vigor of life, when least prepared for death, were hewn down and scattered like chaff before a whirlwind. Here are heaps of slain, weltering in their own blood, their bodies mangled, their limbs shattered, and almost every vestige of human form and countenance destroyed. Here are multitudes trodden under foot, and the war-horse has left the track of his hoof on many a crushed and mutilated frame. Here are several sufferers; they live, but live without hope or consolation. Justice dispatches the criminal with a single stroke, but the victims of war, falling by casual, undirected blows, often expired in lingering agony, their deep groans moving no compassion, their limbs writhing on the earth with pain, their lips parched with a burning thirst, their wounds open to the chilling air, the memories of home rushing to their minds, but not a voice of friendship or comfort reaching their ears."

Second: Its demoralizing influences. You claim that war is necessary in order to clear up the moral atmosphere. Yes, when the opening of the graves in our cemeteries will purify the atmosphere around us, when poison in the fountain will purify the stream, when evil shall have been overcome of evil, then will war serve as a purifier of the moral atmosphere.

This claim borders on the ridiculous. My friend will soon make of war the universal panacea for every human ill. The one who can make war a purifier of the moral atmosphere deserves to be classed as the great miracle-worker of modern times. War has never had such influence and never will until nature shall have reversed her processes. Examples of the opposite influence are to be seen on every hand. Any one familiar with the workings of war as they really are must know that its moral influence is the greatest curse of all things connected with the terrible scourge. War is in every respect cruel in its nature, inhuman in its practise, and grossly immoral in its influences. It has not one redeeming quality; it is beastly and rotten to the core. Look at the days of our own Civil War. While thousands of our best boys were literally rotting in prison, or dying on the fields of battle, dissipation was never more rife at home. Gambling flourished in its worst form, and in that immoral atmosphere men pillaged the Government on every hand. Many of the present ill-gotten fortunes were then begun in gigantic contract frauds, and that idea of getting rich by a scheme of gambling, or some of the unholy methods of war-times, still lingers, like a virus, in the veins of public sentiment. Listen once more to the strong words of Channing: "Consider the influence of war on the character of those who make it their trade.

They let themselves for slaughter, place themselves, servile instruments, passive machines, in the hands of rulers, to execute the bloodiest mandates without a thought of the justice of the cause in which they are engaged. What a school is this for human character? From men trained in battle to ferocity, accustomed to the perpetration of cruel deeds, accustomed to take human life without sorrow or remorse, habituated to esteem an unthinking courage a substitute for every virtue, encouraged by plunder to prodigality, taught improvidence by perpetual hazard and exposure, restrained only by an iron discipline, which is withdrawn in peace and unfitted by the restless and irregular career of war for the calm and uniform pursuits of ordinary life. From such men what ought to be expected but contempt of human rights and of the laws of God? From the nature of his calling the soldier is almost driven to sport with the thought of death, to defy and deride it, and, of course, to banish the thought of that retribution to which it leads. The influence of war on the morals of society is always to be deplored; the suspension of industry multiplies want, and criminal modes of subsistence are the result of this suffering. Commerce, shackled and endangered, loses its upright and honorable character and becomes a system for stratagem and collusion. In war, the moral sentiments of a community are perverted by the admiration of

military exploits. The milder virtues and Christianity are eclipsed by the baleful luster thrown around a ferocious courage. The disinterested and benignant, the merciful and forgiving, those whom Jesus pronounced blessed and honorable, must give place to the hero whose character is stained not only with blood, but sometimes with the foulest vices, but all whose stains are washed away by victory. War especially injures the moral feelings of a people by making human nature cheap in their estimation and human life of as little worth as that of an insect or brute. It creates evil passions, causing people to delight in the stories of famine, pestilence, want, defeat and the most dreadful scourges, which Providence sends on a guilty world. The slaughter of thousands of fellow beings, instead of awakening pity, flushes them with delicious joy, illuminates the city, and dissolves the whole country in revelry and riots. Thus the heart of man is hardened; his worst passions are nourished. Were the prayers, or rather the curses, of warring nations prevalent in heaven, the earth would have long since become a desert; the human race, with all their labors and improvements, would have perished under the sentence of universal extermination."

Third: Its absolute unfairness. War has been defined as a "public armed contest between nations under the sanction of International Law

for the purpose of establishing justice between them."* Lord Bacon speaks of war as "the trials of the right when princes who acknowledge no superior on earth shall put themselves on the justice of God for the deciding of controversies by such successes as it shall please Him to give on either side." One of the earliest and most popular forms of war was the "trial by battle." All difficult questions, whether of property, or of right to an abbey, or even theological disputes, were settled in this outrageous manner. The combatants were usually hired for the occasion and the battle ground was sought with great care. Quite frequently an open space was reserved in a field, or near some church, for the bloody quarrel. Through the influence of the Lombard king, Liutprand, and especially St. Louis of France, the "impious law" was at last abolished, and trial by witnesses established in its stead. The unfair thing in this kind of trial, and that which led to its condemnation and abolition, was the fact that the innocent were made to suffer in the place of the guilty. Now the same principle applies to war and it is open to a like condemnation. In war the innocent suffer for the guilty. We might have had some grounds for rejoicing in the Spanish-American War if those who caused it had been made to suffer, but this was not the case. Such is the demoralizing in-

*Sumner: True Grandeur of a Nation.

fluence of war, but how in the nature of the case can it be otherwise? How can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit? Remember also that jealous revenge, or love of conquest, has caused the bloodiest wars on record. We have noticed, for example, that the War of the Revolution of France was waged by King William for the sole purpose of humbling the pride of Louis XIV., and the War of the Spanish Succession was thrust upon the people by Queen Anne for the purpose of crowning with glory the Duke of Marlborough. War is not the fault of the people. The French are said to be an industrious peace-loving people in general, and the French wars have been waged to gratify the passionate desire of young officers who were so ambitious of rising to military glory. The war-loving element of France cherishes a secret desire to restore the former glory of the empire—the glory graven on monuments, public buildings, boulevards, etc. For this cause she has been willing to engage in war for a quibble of the Monks or to assist the Jesuits, or to make an expedition to Rome in defence of the Pope, or to Mexico for the exaltation of the Latin races. The same is true of Germany and Russia. The German peasantry are said to be a peace-loving people, but their rulers are fired with a burning ambition to rise in military power and extend their dominion to all lands. It has long been the ambition of Russia to extend her boundaries

to the River Danube and so make herself mistress of the Eastern world and at last reach Constantinople. But Austria and Hungary of course oppose such a project, and thus contention is kept alive. And it is through the continuation of such desires and feelings on the part of officers and nobility that France cherishes such devotion for the army, such hatred for Germany, and such bitter memory of Waterloo. To the same cause may be attributed Great Britain's determination to maintain some of her ill-gotten possessions by the construction of a navy equal in fighting power to that of any other two nations in the world, and the same may be truly said of Russia's aspiration for supremacy in Asia and Southern Europe. Hence the necessity for those great standing armies in the old world. Every old nation is thus burdened and bowed to earth.

The army is the center of iniquity, an instrument of crime in the hands of government, a demoralizing influence. It is an anachronism, the organized absolutism of medæval ages projecting itself into our modern civilization. Look at the influence of the army upon France, not only upon her treasury but upon the character of her citizens! Behold how it has defeated civil righteousness and caricatured justice! The army is France and France is the army and soon there will be nothing else. The French nation has become enslaved to the army, and

will sometime be ground to powder beneath the weight of its ponderous massiveness. Look at the influence of the army upon Germany, that great camp of armed men, that war college of the world, yea, and upon all nations of the Old World that are groaning beneath the weight which is fast becoming unbearable.

You say war is necessary in order to arouse sleeping nations to a sense of activity and enterprise, and you cite Cuba, China and Japan as examples. If I read history aright, the poor Cubans have done little else than fight since the days of Columbus. The long cruel centuries of warfare begun by Cortes and Pizarro have continued unbroken to the time of Weyler. Whatever else the Cubans need, it is quite evident that they have had more than enough of war. So far as China is concerned, it might not be the greatest injury that could come to the world should she remain in perpetual sleep! China, asleep in peace, is infinitely better than China awake in war. In reference to Japan, I will say only this, that her recent victory over China seems to have made her drunk with pride ever since, and her ambition to build a great navy and to become equal in fighting power to any modern nation is already imposing a burden upon the people under which they will be crushed ere long.

You say, furthermore, that if war is abolished nothing else can take its place in the creation

of the heroic in man and in the nurture and perfecting of patriotism. To this point I shall reply in another place, but let me say here that this is the greatest mistake imaginable. All that is required is a change of motive. Let man's chief desire be to aid his fellow man and build him up rather than injure and tear him down. Here is abundant opportunity for all that is noblest and most heroic in our nature. This is the law of God and the teaching of Jesus, which are always as true as the stars and suns in their courses. Whoever will but practise the conflict of construction, will learn ere long that "peace hath her victories no less renowned than war."

Fourth: The destructive character of modern warfare. The engines of modern warfare mean absolute destruction. I know this has been used as an argument in favor of peace. It has been argued that since war is so destructive in its nature, for that reason men will not desire to engage in it. Preparation, it is claimed, is a preventative rather than a promoter of war. The more thoroughly a nation is armed, the less cause it will have for going to war and the safer it will be. But what if nations really do go to war? They sometimes do. Nations with these modern engines of destruction are even now engaged in bitter and fierce contest. And when men go to war they will use the most effective engines of destruction avail-

able. This means the annihilation of the army that is unfortunate enough to be first charged upon. The infantry rifles will shoot, one hundred times every four minutes, bullets that will pierce sixty pine boards an inch thick, and kill at a distance of one mile and a half. The Maxim guns can fire seven hundred missiles a minute, killing at a two-mile range. The Gatling gun, with its electric motor, will discharge eighteen hundred missiles of death every minute. The heavy field-pieces will discharge twenty-five six-pound projectiles a minute. Troops cannot live or move in sight of such weapons of destruction. The moment a regiment appears in sight or begins to manuver, it may immediately be swept out of existence by the enemy. Such warfare is infinitely different from what it was in the days of our fathers. They went into battle with squirrel guns, and such fighting as they did might be considered mere sport as compared with war in the face of these field-pieces, Gatling guns, dynamite, and busting shells of death and annihilation.

This phase of the subject has been handled in a masterly manner in a recent book by Jean De Block. Great preparation for war makes most warriors restless for action. But if this foolish, yea, insane, preparation for war in time of peace is in any degree a preventative, it is not the less demoralizing. It weakens trust, it destroys

confidence. How can there be any real fellowship between individuals who cannot trust each other enough to meet unarmed? And how can manhood be developed under such conditions? What real fellowship can exist between nations willing to advertise to the world that they are not noble enough to trust each other? To arm is to mistrust, to mistrust is to betray a lack of confidence in man and faith in God, and this is demoralizing. What can man ever become while he lacks confidence? And how can nations ever hope to rise in the scale of being while they continue to arm to the teeth and glare at each other in bull-dog fashion?

THE POET'S THEME

("What is the cause of the strange silence of American poets concerning America's triumphs on sea and land"?)

"Why should the poet of these pregnant times
Be asked to sing of war's unholy crimes?
To laud and eulogize the trade which thrives
On horrid holocausts of human lives?
Man was a fighting beast when earth was young,
And war the only theme when Homer sung.
'Twixt might and might the equal contest lay—
Not so the battles of our modern day.
Ah, there are worthier themes for poet's pen
In this great hour than bloody deeds of men
Or triumphs of one hero, (though he be
Deserving song for his humility).
The rights of many, not the worth of one,
The coming issues, not the battle done,

The awful opulence and awful need,
The rise of brotherhood, the fall of greed,
The soul of man replete with God's own force,
The call: 'To heights,' and not the cry: 'To horse!'
Are there not better themes in this great age,
For pen of poet or for voice of sage,
Than those old tales of killing? Song is dumb
Only that greater song in time may come.
When comes the bard, he whom the world waits for,
He will not sing of war."

—*Ella Wheeler Wilcox.*

X

EXPANSION

And still, dear Brain, the facts remain—they remain substantially as stated. Everything in nature has evoluted but the human heart—that still remains deceitful and desperately wicked. The trouble in your case is, as I have already tried to point out, that you are dealing with an ideal condition of society. Life is awful, life is tragic, life is deceptive; it is full of conflicting emotions, of heartaches, of enmity and murderous intent. Man simply cannot trust his fellow man—not even his dearest friend. These dreadful influences, which seem to rise out of eternity, at times take complete possession of us all; and what are the nations but aggregations of such wicked, cruel individuals, as we ourselves are? For nations to disarm under such conditions would be the veriest folly. I have often said, with Sherman, that "War is hell," but all is not misery and dissatisfaction, as you declare. There is glory in it; there are expressions of love and good-will which could not be called forth in any other way; there are songs, soul-thrilling and touching and sweet, that only war could create. To sacrifice in a noble cause is Godlike. It is always "sweet to die for one's country."

I find myself agreeing with you on more points and in a larger degree, however, than I at first thought possible, and I now find myself in substantial agreement with your last lecture and therefore, there is little or nothing that calls for reply. So I turn in this letter to another phase of the subject which I have overlooked. You have made frequent use of the terms "imperialists" and "imperialism," as applied to our occupancy of the Philippines. You have condemned in strong language the idea of expansion, declaring that in expanding our dominion we have weakened and endangered our national life, opening the way to other and more dreadful complications. I find myself entirely out of sympathy with these ideas. Our occupancy of the Eastern Islands came in the divine order of things. It was ours to deliver them and it is ours to protect them. Having released them from Spanish oppression, it would have been worse than cruel to have abandoned those helpless, half-enlightened, ill-treated children of misfortune to their own destruction or to the mercy of the merciless Spaniards. Having wrested them from the bonds of the cruel government, only one righteous Christian thing remains, and that is to stand by and protect them until they are able to govern themselves. And, in regard to expansion, I am sure, dear friend, that when you consider the matter thoroughly, you will not wish to class

yourself among the anti-expansionists of American history. That men should oppose expansion is not strange; they always have done so. Many have always been opposed to that which was for the best interest of mankind. Nevertheless, expansion has ever been the watchword of the ages.

Abraham was an expansionist. God called him to leave his narrow surroundings, his home and kindred, and go out into a great, unknown region, where his posterity was to become as numberless as the sands of the sea and the stars in the firmament.

Moses was an expansionist. He listened to a call commanding him to bid adieu to the beautiful palace of the Pharaohs and to lead the oppressed Israelites out of the night of Egyptian bondage into the land of liberty—into a larger world of prosperity and happiness. Inspired by this command he feared Pharaoh's hosts as little as he feared the bulrushes on the banks of the Nile.

Isaiah was an expansionist. He had a glorious vision of a better world—a larger and nobler humanity. "Lift up thine eyes round about and see: all they gather themselves together, they come to thee: thy sons shall come from far and thy daughters shall be nursed at thy side. Then thou shalt see, and flow together, and thine heart shall fear and be enlarged; because the abundance of the sea

shall be converted unto thee, the forces of the Gentiles shall come unto thee. The multitude of camels shall cover thee, the dromedaries of Midian and Epha; all they from Sheba shall come: they shall bring gold and incense; and they shall show forth the praises of the Lord." Again the same writer declares: "Ye shall go out with joy and be led forth with peace: the mountains and the hills shall break before you into singing and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands. Instead of the thorn shall come up the fir-tree and instead of the briar shall come up the myrtle-tree: and it shall be to the Lord for a name, for an everlasting sign that shall not be cut off."

The revelator of Patmos was an expansionist. He beheld the new Jerusalem coming down from above, which means a larger and a more glorious world, regenerated and like unto heaven.

Paul, the apostle, was an expansionist. His aim was to carry the Gospel to Rome, and from thence to the whole world. He declared that there was no difference between the Jew and the Greek, and that all nations, classes and colors, were alike in the sight of the Creator.

Jesus himself was an expansionist. He said: "Other sheep I have that are not of this fold." "He that doeth the will of My Father which is in heaven, the same is My brother and My sister and My mother." And when He was sending

forth His disciples, He said: "Go, make disciples of all nations." His touching illustration of what took place on the Jericho road shows plainly that in Jesus' thought all classes and races of mankind are alike.

Our great poets have been expansionists, and Tennyson was one of the greatest of these.

> "For I doubt not, through the ages,
> One unceasing purpose runs;
> And the thoughts of men are broadened
> With the process of the suns."

The heroes of the Reformation were expansionists. They felt constrained to break with the tyranny and superstition of the dark ages; to place the Bible in the hands of the common people, that they might study, understand, believe and worship, in accordance with enlightened reason and the dictates of their own consciences.

Columbus was an expansionist. He felt moved to cross the sea and bring to light a great new continent.

Galileo was an expansionist. He saw a vision of a new and more wonderful universe, with the sun, and not the earth, as a center of a system which was only a small part of the vast whole.

The Pilgrim Fathers were expansionists—expansionists in government and religious liberty. They refused any longer to be dictated to in matters of conscience by kings and potentates: they sought liberty of worship and of govern-

ment: and for this cause they cut clear from the old world and steered their barque toward the new.

> "Laws, freedom, truth, and faith in God,
> Came with those exiles o'er the waves."

Lowell was an expansionist, as he claimed we all should be.

> "'Tis as easy to be heroes as to sit the idle slaves
> Of a legendary virtue carved upon our father's graves."
> "Lo! before us gleams her camp-fires; we ourselves must pilgrims be;
> Launch our Mayflower and steer boldly through the desperate, wintry sea,
> Nor attempt the future's portal with the past's blood-rusty key."

Jefferson was an expansionist and for that cause our nation has not ceased to thank heaven. When Napoleon was about to engage in that awful contest with England, the whole of Louisiana, including New Orleans, was in the possession of France. Napoleon, fearing that England would send a fleet and seize it, offered to dispose of the immense territory for the paltry sum of fifteen million dollars, or two cents an acre. President Jefferson saw his great opportunity, and made the purchase, although in the face of the strongest protests. Men like Mr. Quincy condemned such action, declaring that it was unconstitutional, and that the natural boundaries of the United States on the west were the Rocky Mountains; that the addition of this vast territory, embracing a seaboard of fifteen hun-

dred miles, and including a race of "Anglo-Hispano-Gallo-Americans, who bask in the sands of the Mississippi," would be an injury to the welfare of this country from which it might never recover. The majority ruled; however, Jefferson's opinion prevailed; and he thus achieved one of the greatest acts of statesmanship in his grand career, for this purchase not only settled the matter with France, but prevented England from getting control, and gave us the great West beyond the Mississippi, besides giving us New Orleans. It gave us a million square miles, or six hundred million of acres, thus more than doubling the area of the United States.

Dr. Marcus Whitman was an expansionist. After the Louisiana Purchase, when Congress, under President Polk, had decided to annex Texas, the question arose as to what should be done with this vast country called Oregon, west of the Rocky Mountains and reaching to Alaska. The English would likely have gotten possession of it, had it not been for the indomitable energy and far-sightedness of our noble missionary, Marcus Whitman, who was then laboring at Walla Walla. The story of his long journey over four thousand miles on horseback, in the midst of terrible suffering, storms and torrents, starvation, sickness and wild Indians, is familiar, and how he was enabled to reach Congress in time to save this great territory to the United States. We have conquered the Philippines,

and, according to the principles of International Law, they have become our rightful possessions. We must defend the defenseless; we cannot leave these poor creatures to their own destruction. They are not able to govern themselves; it is our right to govern them until they are. All opposition to expansion in the past has therefore been mistaken and absurd.

Kipling has expressed it well:

"Take up the white man's burden,
Send forth the best ye breed;
Go bind your sons to exile,
To serve your captives' need;
To wait in heavy harness,
On fluttered folk and wild;
Your new-caught, sullen peoples,
Half devil and half child."

XI

DEVELOPMENT OF THE WAR SYSTEM

Dear Brawn:— find myself in hearty agreement with your ideas on expansion, in the main, and I thank you for what your instructive letter has done toward clearing up my thought in this direction. No, I do not care to be classed among anti-expansionists, but I must still insist that it is not in great extent of territory that a nation's true greatness consists. You speak of the evil of human nature. It is unquestionably so. There are all the evils which you mention, and more, but I rejoice to believe that there is good enough to counteract and overcome the evil. We are commanded to "be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good." The war system has had no small part in generating this fighting, quarrelsome disposition which has caused the unhappiness and destruction of humanity in the ages past. Here is a boy with a fighting nature. Some are ignorant enough to say, "Let him fight it out," but that is absurd. Every fight strikes the fighting desire deeper and deeper into his nature—the more he fights the more he wants to. Fighting will devilize, but it will never humanize, the boy. Or here is a young fellow

with a desire for drink: what then? "O, just let him drink it out." Indeed! When did the drink habit ever work in that way? A fire bursts out in the center of your dwelling. What are you going to do? Nothing, just let it burn out. But how much is going to remain after the burning-out process is over? All this is just as reasonable as an attempt to fight the war-spirit out of the nations by keeping them at it. War does not so act upon the nations. The more they fight the more they want to, and the more cause will they have for fighting. Every war and every quarrel of any kind sows the seed of contention and hatred and strife, which are sure to yield fruit after their kind. War makes wars, and wars make hell.

Second, in reply to your inquiry as to why this war nature exists, has always existed, and is not essentially different to-day from what it was in the dark ages. Let me explain to you just why it is so. You claim that it is a God-ordained element in our nature, by which, coming into conflict with the good, man is disciplined, developed, and perfected; that it acts as the positive and negative poles, by means of which all that is good and precious in life and thought is born into the world. Then one of the poles must necessarily be evil; one side of life must needs be bad. This is an old doctrine which most sensible people have ceased long since to believe If this were true the devil

would fill just as honorable a place in the universe as God Himself. Study this theory honestly and earnestly and see where it will land you—in fatalism and inevitable disaster.

The war system of to-day is the result of false education—the ripened fruit of evil sowing. Man has been misguided: human energy and thought have been directed in wrong channels: men should have grown up through higher thought into nobler living, and thus help one another as the angels in heaven do. Instead of this they have been taught to hate, to plunder, and to destroy one another. How has this false training been promoted? It was born and nurtured in savagery. We may not be able to determine how far back those rude, brutal children of men and nature began to disagree, but somewhere, sometime, and for some cause, they came to blows. That was the beginning of war. Soon fists were intensified by stones, and arms by rude spears. At last it was not only individual against individual, but clan against clan, and tribe against tribe. Of course they had to compete with each other as best they could in the production of the most deadly weapons and in the most effective use of them. Thus war became a business and the war system continued to become more perfect. At last music, glittering armor and beautiful uniforms were added as a means of counteracting the horrors of war. Now man is so constituted that he comes to love

those things which he is taught to love, and to hate those things which he is taught to hate. So men have grown to be lovers of war: not so much lovers of the real fighting part, perhaps, as of the pomp and glitter and imagined honor which has been thrown around the cruel thing. As humanity advanced, and men grew to be lovers of greatness and worshipers of heroes, a false standard of greatness was created by war; and as love for beautiful women has ever been the chief source of inspiration to the hero, and since women have become lovers and worshipers of the heroes of battle, so war has become the chief attraction for the ambitious youth; and the whole war-system has in this way reached its present height of perfection.

In the early heroic days of Greece and Rome, children were literally nurtured on the thrilling tales of savage wars. The command of the Spartan mother to her son, as he was departing for the battle was, that either he must return "with the shield or upon it." In the song, "Bingen on the Rhine," a soldier gives us the impressions which in childhood days he received from his father. I think it runs like this:

"And in those young and tender years,
When I was but a child,
My heart leapèd forth to hear him tell
Of battles fierce and wild;
And when he died and left us
To divide the scanty horde,
I let them take whate'er they would,
But kept my father's sword.

And with boyish love I hung it
Where the bright light used to shine,
On the cottage walls of Bingen,
Of Bingen on the Rhine."

Such influences have been instilled into the minds of children from time immemorial, even to the present day, not by fathers only, but by their mothers as well. "The voice of man is yet given to martial praise, and the honors of victory are chanted even by the lips of women. The mother rocking the infant on her knee stamps the image of war upon his tender mind, at the age more impressionable than wax; she nurses his slumber with its music, fills his waking hours with its stories, and selects for his playthings the drum and sword. From the child is formed the man; and who can weigh the influence of a mother's spirit upon the opinions of his life? The hand which trains the child is like the hand at the end of a long lever: a gentle effort suffices to heave the enormous weight of succeeding years. As the boy advances to youth he is fed, like Achilles, not on honey and milk only, but on bear's marrow and lions' hearts; he draws the nutriment of his soul from a literature whose beautiful fields are moistened by human blood. Fain would I offer my tribute to the father of poetry, standing with harp of immortal melody on the mountain-top of distant Antiquity—to those stories of courage and sacrifice which emblazon the annals of Greece and Rome—to the fulminations

of Demosthenes and the splendors of Tully—to the sweet verse of Virgil and the poetic prose of Livy; fain would I offer my tribute to the new literature, which shot up in modern times as a vigorous forest from the burned site of ancient woods—to the passionate song of the troubadour in France and the minnesinger in Germany—to the thrilling ballad of Spain and the delicate music of the Italian lyre: but from all these has breathed the breath of War that has swept the heart-strings of men in all the thronging generations." *

The child mind is plastic and impressionable; the stream of life is directed from its fountain.

> "Time its impressions stronger makes
> And streams their channels deeper wear."

Thus channels of thought are determined and habits are formed. War has plowed its bloody furrows through suffering humanity until people have come foolishly to feel that it is a part of our national existence, an indispensable necessity. But no greater fallacy has ever inflicted its deceptive and destructive influence on the minds of men. That men should be lovers of conquest is clearly the result of an abnormal condition of life. No sane man can believe in it, no just and good God can be its author, and no righteous man its defender.

Third, in reply to your question as to what shall take the place of war in the settlement of

*Sumner. True Grandeur of a Nation.

those difficulties which arise between nations. I reply, a court of arbitration such as shall meet the approval of all nations. But such a method, you insist, could not give universal satisfaction at this time—and would not therefore be at all practicable. I do not quite understand what you mean by the phrase, "this time." Surely this time is not essentially different from most other times. You seem to indicate that arbitration has been almost, if not entirely, a failure. On the contrary, no project for the settlement of differences between men and nations has had a more effective or a more commendable history for the time it has existed. According to Mr. Trueblood* it has been a hundred years in practise, during which time it has settled over one hundred difficult questions with entire satisfaction. "Wherever it has been applied," says Mr. Trueblood, "it has succeeded; there is not a real exception to be noted. The cases which it has settled have stayed settled; not even the ghost of such a case has ever arisen to disturb anybody's tranquility; it has been tried by thirty-one nations great and small, in the Old World and the New, the United States and Great Britain leading, the former with about half the whole number of cases, the latter with nearly one-third." The Court of Arbitration here described is not however the kind that I shall advocate. Of course it is good and has

* The Federation of the World.

done good, but there is one that is infinitely better, simpler and more to be desired. This one has always been at our disposal and when we shall learn to apply it to nations as well as to individuals, all wrongs shall be righted, and the evil source, out of which all disputes and all wars arise, destroyed. The world will be better, for it ought to be; man shall live in peace with his fellow man, for this is what he ought to do; man shall help his brother, and each shall seek the good of the other, for this is man's plain duty. Then shall our little war-cursed planet be what God designed it should be, and what He would have us make it—an emblem of heaven and not of hell. Then shall "righteousness spring out of the earth and joy shall look down from heaven."

XII

THE PROBLEM SIMPLIFIED

Dear Brain:—Discussion of the great problems of human life and destiny may be classed under a two-fold division, namely, what has been and is: what might have been and may be.

This two-fold division suggests two classes of thinkers, and two lines of thought: first, those who seem to believe that everything that has ever occurred in the world has taken place according to fixed and unalterable laws over which man has had absolutely no control; second, the larger number who believe in man as a free moral agent endowed with power of choice, and therefore able to subdue the forces of nature and to stand triumphant above them.

The first view may, in its extremest form, be called fatalism. This makes man the victim of a merciless plan, the subject of an arbitrary ruling. If the world happens to go well with him, if fortune smiles upon his pathway, then for him, at least, life may be worth the living, But if he is destined to fall beneath the grinding wheels of fate, then is he utterly powerless to change the sad condition, and the only spark ofcomfort that life can possibly hold for him is his ability to take himself out of it.

This kind of God is only sovereignty and law. His laws are greater than their maker because He is powerless to change them. He has set His world agoing, then has withdrawn from it and left it to go on and on forever, grinding out something that may be for His own glory. According to this view, all wars and pestilence and famine, and every kind of cruelty that the world has known, have been prearranged and definitely planned. Human volition is predetermined by antecedent causes, acting by necessity. Of course this doctrine takes various forms and includes various shades of thinkers, among whom are those who believe that the plan is a good one made by a good being and will come out all right in the end; others who believe that it is cruel, that life is an imposition, something that would have been contrary to our wishes had we been consulted in regard to it.

Now if we include such a cruel thing as war in God's original plan, how are we going to harmonize it with Infinite goodness? If war is evil in its nature it must have had an evil origin and cannot therefore have been of God. On the other hand, if we leave war out of God's plan on the ground that it is cruel and evil in its nature and in its results, how are we going to account for its existence through the centuries, and how are we going to dispose of the wars of the Old Testament? If we take this position, insurmountable difficulties confront

us. One is, that the human race has been permitted to go contrary to the will of the Creator through all the centuries past; the other, that the prophets and all the inspired writers of the Old Testament have not spoken truly. You can thus see where such a view, carried to a logical conclusion, will land one—in utter unbelief in the inspiration of the Bible, and inevitable denial of the omnipotence and overruling power of the Almighty. But now you ask if we abandon this position as impossible, are not we still confronted by grave difficulties? How can we believe in the God of battles, how can we believe in the wars of the Old Testament as having been sanctioned and conducted by Jehovah? How can we believe in the Father who would not only permit, but aid, one portion of his children in triumphing over another portion in such cruel conflicts as are recorded in the Old Testament; and how can we believe in the God who has not only permitted the bloody conflicts of history, on land and sea, but who seems to have answered the prayers of those whose cause was just, in granting victories to their armies?

To these profound questions I apply the scientific method, namely: I seek to discover the simplest and most reasonable explanation. What God should do becomes a question of what I would do if I were in His stead, and what God has planned for the human race be-

comes a question of what I should plan were it possible for me to create a similar world, people it with similar beings and launch it upon its wondrous journey. We know God by our better selves, for every man's God is but an enlarged edition of himself; and are not God's forethought and final purposes toward humanity our own best and noblest thoughts in the interests of mankind infinitely extended?

In order to understand the meaning and purposes of war, and in order to justify the Almighty in permitting it, we must needs admit into our discussion an important factor, namely, the disobedience and fall of man. This I state, not as a theological dogma, but as an historic fact—a fact that is too plain to be overlooked, for it is being illustrated all around us and in our own individual experiences. Man has been disobedient, and war is one of the sad fruits of that disobedience. This does not solve the problem but it simplifies it; it does not remove the mystery but it does diminish it. Take, for example, two families who are brought up side by side, with equal advantages, equal opportunities and equal temptations. In the one case the entire family puts forth the best possible effort, they overcome, and rise to positions of trust and honor, thus making life happy for themselves and bringing gladness and rejoicing to the hearts of the parents. But the other

family proves to be disobedient, does not strive to overcome or to rise in the scale of being; hence they fall into sin and crime and so find themselves struggling in the midst of a thorny and thistly world where their struggles are hard and their punishments severe. Between the two families there is an infinite difference. We can see what one might have been by observing what the other is. And yet they are not forsaken or cast off. The father's heart is made warm toward them by the intensity of his grief. They must be punished, but in the midst of punishment he stands by them to strengthen and to aid them all he can. It would have been infinitely better had they not gone astray, but having disobeyed and having gone astray, other and different means must now be permitted; they must be punished to the end that they may be redeemed.

The human race has been disobedient. War is one of the sad results of that disobedience. God permits what He did not originally plan for; He permits this awful discipline, though it pains and wrings the Infinite heart. He guides His children through the grief and sorrow which disobedience has brought upon them; He would not be a true Father could He do otherwise. And therefore the wars of the Old Testament were sanctioned and guided by Him. He interposed in behalf of those whose cause was righteous. He turned the tide of battle

against the enemies of His people and of righteousness, not because He sought their destruction or gloried in their downfall, but rather because He desired that they should repent and turn unto Him and live. And the same has been true of every righteous war in history, until the present time. God has permitted them for such a wise purpose; and surely every sensible person will admit that His plans have been extended and His mission fulfilled by means of war, in a manner that could not have been accomplished in any other way. But war certainly is wrong when it could have been avoided. This I now see more clearly than ever. That it is a crime for nations which have reached a high degree of civilization and Christian culture to settle their differences by a resort to bloody conflict when they are capable of settling such contentions infinitely better by peaceful methods, I gladly admit. The nations are coming gradually to recognize this as they advance in the scale of being, and so they are resorting less and less to the use of arms. But they reach this position only in the hard processes of human development. The real purpose of weapons of war is to teach people how to do without them. Human nature cannot be forced or driven—it must learn through bitter experience.

No longer do I base my argument on the existence of a conflict in nature. Your treatment

of that part of the subject has convinced me that harmony rather than conflict is the chief characteristic of God's handiwork. But you have enabled me to reach this more practical position which I am sure you must necessarily accept. All the evils of this cruel tragic world are the sad result of man's disobedience and armed force is a God ordained means of holding evil in check and protecting society until poor prodigal humanity shall come again unto that holy and happy condition from which it has departed.

If what I have said in this letter is true, then must your position seem to be more disastrous than ever. Your claim that all wars are wrong and contrary to the will of God casts discredit upon the holy prophets and inspired writers, who claim to have revealed the will of God to man. And your assertion that those writers only thought that they were interpreting God's mind to man, but were really reading their own will and their own human ideas and nature into the Divine Record to such a degree as to destroy its divinity, making it the will of man rather than of God, destroys for me the inspiration of the Bible entirely; for if I do not know when it is that God is speaking, or when it is that man is speaking, then must I be in doubt as to what is man's and what is God's; what is inspired or what is not; and the Holy Book is no safe guide for me. Just think of what such

a position involves and where it must necessarily lead the one who holds it—into endless difficulty, confusion, scepticism, and inevitable despair.

BRAWN.

XIII

WHERE THE BLAME BELONGS

At this juncture we dismiss our fictitious characters, Brawn and Brain. They have served our purpose well. Brawn, on account of pressing engagements at home, finds himself unable to continue the discussion. That is not strange. With all he has on hand it would be quite unfair to expect him to continue; and what more could we hope for from any man on that side of the subject? He has certainly made the most of a weak case; the cause of war has surely found in him an able advocate. He marshalled his arguments as a general would marshal his soldiers, and he has fought bravely to the end. He started in with a consciousness of triumphant success. But we have seen him weaken at many a point as he was brought face to face with the other side of this great truth which he had not analyzed or thought of before. So we have noticed with delight how our honored friend has been led to make one admission after another until at last he reached a medium position, but we can read between the lines the short and blessed story of complete surrender. Forced to abandon his argument based on war in nature, which argument he considered "unanswerable," and no

longer able to maintain his theory by the authority of Scripture, he falls back, as a last resort, upon an old theological dogma—the "Fall of Man." And in this he finds sufficient cause for all the wars that have cursed the world. That all wars and all other evils are due to man's disobedience is not denied. But why should men and nations continue to be disobedient? Why don't they become obedient? Why do they continue to fall? Why don't they rise in the scale of being and so lift others with themselves? But I do not consider this last argument of Brawn's to be of sufficient weight to merit an extended reply. In all his discussion, however, Mr. Brawn has surely shown a fair Christian spirit, and absolute honesty. His setting forth of evidence from the war point of view has certainly been masterly; but as war is built up and sustained upon the basis of a false philosophy, so our good friend has come at last to realize, by his own independent thought rather than by our instruction, that the evidence employed in the defense of the war system must likewise rest upon the basis of a false philosophy; and the same result must come to all who will study the subject as thoroughly, and deal with it as honestly as Mr. Brawn has done. God grant that every Brawn may meet his Brain ere long!

And now I proceed to place the blame where it most truly belongs, namely, upon the Chris-

tian Church, minister, teacher, statesman and editor. The Church and ministry of this age have so far departed from the spirit of Christ in teaching and example, that it becomes exceedingly difficult for a close student to discover on just what grounds we may lay claims to being the Church and ministry of Jesus Christ. I limit this part, however, strictly to the theme under discussion. Upon what grounds can the Church and the ministry of Jesus lend their approval to the cruel war system by which the minds and hearts of so many of even Christ's professed followers have become imbued and intoxicated? Certainly not on the grounds of Jesus' teaching, or His example. No straw of evidence can there be found in favor of war in any form or under any condition whatsoever.

Look at the sweet picture of the early Church. Oh that we could enjoy such fellowship to-day! It was Christian, the only Christian Church that the world has ever seen; it was indeed the society of Jesus; He was its center, and His spirit was its life. As all the roots of the tree take up their nourishment into one stem; as all the rivers of the earth pour their waters into one sea; as all the veins of the body empty themselves into one heart, from whence the tide of blood, borne along the bounding arteries, is returned again and yet again to be distributed to every member according to its need, so was

it in the early Church. All things were held in common—for the good of all; it was a mutual society in which no one made claims to absolute ownership of anything, but all was for the common good. Think of those sweet characters such as Felicita, and Perpetua, Ignatius, and Polycarp. How the true spirit of Jesus was revealed in that humble, sweet, Church life; how it attracted and conquered kings as well as princes; the warrior unsheathed his sword at the altar of self-sacrificing devotion, and the king knelt in humble submission to Jesus the King of Kings. Glorious triumph, that the emperor should one day declare Christianity the religion of the empire! But since that time the real Church of Christ has not been seen; its members became absorbed in earthly power, wealth, and splendor; and the battle-song has been even sweeter than the psalm of praise. And so imbued were men, like even the great, good Constantine, with the spirit of war, that the vision of the cross, as it blazed in the sky, was to him a symbol of triumph in the literal fight; and the words, "In this sign conquer," were thought to mean the conquering of their enemies in literal warfare. But such is not, nor ever was, the true meaning of the cross of Christ. The cross is a symbol of suffering, of endurance, of patience, of self-sacrifice and death, and these are the forces which always conquer in the end.

So, bishops and popes became the heads of armies, clanking their golden spurs through the streets of Cologne, or thundering the praises of warriors at the holy Vatican, and the Protestant ministry has followed in their footsteps. Too often is the Christian pulpit desecrated even to-day by the voice of some yellow preacher who, under the guise of patriotism, bids for the approval of those lovers of gore, by advocating war with some nation whose conduct he declares has been very impolite. I have heard the yellow preacher advocating war between England and America on account of the little Venezuelan ruffle. Think of a war between England and America! What unspeakable calamity would that be for the whole world! But the fact that one is at liberty to advocate such a calamity in the Christian pulpit of to-day is still more to be deplored. The yellow preacher—what a pest he is! He loves to be heard far and loud. He loves recognition, and is willing to have it even at the expense of war. He works hand in hand with the yellow press, and obtains many flattering notices from the editor, who secretly despises him. The yellow press and the yellow pulpit are continually calling for the redress of some national wrong—usually an imaginary one. There are ministers who take delight in making their own nation compel some other, or, in fact, all others to lick the dust in the presence of the congregation.

They often create a ripple of applause from a portion of their hearers, and even the older ones show a wonderful power of endurance. Would it be irreverent to inquire whether these dear old saints do not at times enjoy such exhibitions of bold, courageous, (?) outspoken patriotism? Perhaps it would. But appearance has a language which we cannot help interpreting. Quite often such a man receives much praise, and he acquires the name of being a courageous, outspoken, brave fellow; one who is not afraid to tell what he believes; a man of great learning and stalwart courage. Such men, for such reasons, receive praise even from Christians, because the Christian Church is still so unchristlike. But from the higher or more Christlike type of Christians, and from the higher order of Christ's ministers, we expect better things.

How may this sentiment be changed. First, the change must begin where every good and precious thing begins—in childhood. This is the province of the mother. Let her cease to lull the babe to sleep with war-songs; let her cease to purchase little implements of war—the toy drum, swords and bugles, and the like—for the amusement of the little child; let her know that there is a higher life and a nobler calling than that of the soldier for her boy to follow. He serves his country best who serves it out of armor. He who dies for his country does well, but he who lives for it does better. To become

an excellent swordsman is only a cheap thing at best, but to become a hero of peace, a savior of life, a benefactor of mankind, this, this is brave, heroic, Christlike, and no higher achievement can ever be recorded in the annals of the world. Great is the sphere of the mother's influence! Let it be for good. Let her remember that "the hand that rocks the cradle is the hand that rules the world." The child will rally around the standard of the mother; what is greatest in her thought will always be greatest in his. In the words of Fanny J. Crosby:

> "O wondrous power, how little understood;
> Entrusted to the mother's mind alone,
> To fashion genius to the soul for good!"

Second, in education. Here I shall consider the school teachers and the books. Many of our school books are still generative of the war-loving spirit which, in embryo at least, exists in the nature of every child. Heroes of carnal warfare still hold the most important place in the curriculum of modern education. Children are required to study battle-fields with their degrading scenes of carnage, blood and death. Men of war are quite frequently invited to address school children, and quite often they will choose scenes of bloody conflict which have become a part of a warrior's life. Thus the highest ambition of many a youth has been excited and aroused to become a soldier that he may, at last, become a general. And here, too,

the teacher is quite often at fault. It is true that the teacher cannot revise the school books, or erase those injurious things from their pages, but he can do considerable to avoid that which is injurious. Any teacher who would select such a reading as "Sparticus to the Gladiators" as a proper oration for one of his pupils to recite at some public contest, ought to be ashamed. We blot out all that is considered injurious before we place the newspapers in the hands of our prisoners to read. Would it not be well to adopt the same method with the text-books of to-day? Let it be the teacher's principal mission to stamp upon the heart and mind of each child the truth of a grand old text-book too much neglected: "He that is slow to anger is greater than the mighty; and he that ruleth his own spirit than he that taketh a city."

Third, the Church and the ministry have sadly departed from Christ's teaching and spirit in this matter, as has been already shown. From the lower grades of church-members and the lower types of ministers we may not hope for a much better condition for a long time to come. Multitudes will continue to court and to applaud the coarsest kind of harangue by the coarsest grades of preachers, if only it bears, or seems to bear, the stamp of patriotism upon it—patriotism falsely so called—patriotism, that much abused term—patriotism, which needs to be

lifted out of the filth and mire into which its murderers have trampled it. There are two kinds of patriotism. One is the kind that would influence a nation to separate itself from all other nations, and set itself against all others; to rise by putting all others down; to build itself upon the ruins of those whom it would destroy for that purpose. This is the patriotism of the jingo. It creates jealousy; it generates hostility and strife, which ripen into armies, navies, wars, devastation and ruin. The other is the patriotism which acknowledges the rights of all other nations and the dependence of the one upon all of the others. Therefore it seeks to cooperate with all others for the promotion of unity, peace, brotherly friendship and prosperity. This is the patriotism of the true statesman. It is harmonious and peaceful because it is beneficent, humane and Christian. this is the only true patriotism, because it is founded upon the beneficent laws of God.

There are two great powers by which mankind has always been controlled. One is the law of force and the other is the law of love. These powers are represented by Rome and Palestine, Caesar and Christ; the one is external and forced, the other is internal and is a growth; the one is natural and harmonious, the other is unnatural and conflicting. It may be difficult for some people to determine which of these two forces is the stronger or the most effective,

but as to the one that is most commendable and most enduring, no argument is necessary. The law of love is the law of God; and upon the basis of this law all mankind can unite and cooperate if they will. And it is no sign of weakness, it is no indication of a lack of heroism, it is not for the purpose of giving expression to some fine-sounding phrases or beautiful theory, that we declare that it is not only possible, but also practicable, for the whole world to unite and cooperate; and each work for the good of all, upon the basis of the eternal and all-powerful law of love, which is the law of God.

To glory in the Stars and Stripes is of course patriotic; to sing its praises is patriotic; but to make every other flag on the high seas "dip" to it is, of course, the essence of patrotism; to ridicule some other nation and to remind their people that they would be lost sight of in one corner of certain of our great states is also quite patriotic; to boast that we could feed the world with the production of one state and then have enough and to spare is also somewhat patriotic; but it is too mild a kind of patriotism for the majority, and so the patriot must resort to the highest pinnacle of bombastic oratory, warning whatever remains of the inhabited world that we are an unconquerable nation and could whip them all together if we would so desire, and the only reason why we don't do it is because we are such a long-suffering, peace-loving, benevo-

lent and Christlike people. What marvelous triumphs these patriots achieve! To what infinite heights do they raise their gazing admirers! What worlds their country might conquer if only they could get at them—if only they were tangible—if they could but bridge the chasms and land the troops. But now from the higher type of ministers and the more Christlike disciples of Jesus we do expect better things, and to those higher classes I now appeal. First: the ministry. Let the ministers of Jesus abstain from all that the Master in His teaching and spirit does not approve; let them cease to indulge in war-scenes and thrilling illustrations taken from the fields of blood and death. Let those abominable scenes be expunged or omitted, and above all, let the servant of the Prince of Peace never advocate war either in public or private, under any circumstances whatever. Second: the Church must reform or cease to bear the name Christian. Christ's mission was peace on earth and good-will to men; and this also is the mission of His Church or she has none. Church-members should refuse to do military service. Churches ought not to tolerate such an institution as the boys' brigade, at least in its present form. It costs the writer no small sacrifice to make such a statement. Personally no society could be dearer to him. The likeness of every member of a certain boys' brigade is literally stamped

on his heart. Part of the exercises are excellent and thoroughly in accordance with Jesus' teaching. The pledge, for instance, to "abstain from all profane, vulgar or indecent language, from the use of tobacco and all intoxicating liquors." The requirement of each boy to "attend church and Sunday-school" cannot be too highly commended; but the rifle and sword exercises, when we consider what they mean, cannot be called Christian, and are therefore unbecoming to any branch of the Church of Christ. What can we substitute for the guns and swords, what can take the place of the war-element in the brigade? This, we are informed, is the part which trains the boys to be heroic and courageous; this denied, then the organization must lose its interest and fall to pieces. Here let me introduce that principle up to which all that I have said has been leading. I mean a different motive, a different and a higher standard of greatness, the standard of Jesus, the practise of non-resistance, which is the highest possible achievement and the most truly heroic. Smiting with the fist or the sword is weakness on exhibition; non-resistance is the noblest manifestation of strength that the world can see. The men who overcome are the truly great. And what is true of an individual is likewise true of a nation. Here then is a glorious opportunity for the boys' brigade. Let them revise their creed, let them reorganize upon this

new basis, the basis of non-resistance; let it be in their pledge never to lift up sword against fellow man or sister nation. They will soon learn that to be a hero of peace requires infinitely more courage and endurance than to be a hero of war. Whatever seems to them to be the greatest and bravest thing, that will the boys desire to do. What boys' brigade will be the first to start? May it be the one that the writer has in mind and heart.

Fourth, the Christian statesman. The author would not cast any uncharitable reflections upon England. For an American, especially one born under the British flag, to abuse the land of his birth would be somewhat like beating the mother who nurtured him. But English statesmen must be warned. England should be made, through her friends, to know the feeling of the world towards her. Who is to blame for the war in South Africa, and what was the motive which prompted that cruel war? English statesmen largely are to blame and the world knows well that the motive was greed. The colonizing spirit has become to England, a disease. The world has agreed, therefore, to inform her that she must call a halt. For another colonizing expedition on the part of England can never be tolerated by the civilized world. Let England's statesmen who bear the name of Christ cease talking of "revenge" or of "cleaning up" any part of the world, because they

desire to grasp what property belongs to others. The world is warning England; let England warn some of her injudicious statesmen to be more cautious.

It cannot be denied that Christian nations and Christian statesmen are largely to blame for the unfortunate uprising in China. Christian nations are responsible for the existence of the present alien Manchu dynasty. It was General Gordon and the American Generals who prevented its being overthrown by the Tai Ping rebellion. It was Christian statesmen who persuaded the Chinese to receive instruction in modern warfare. We taught them how to fight and they are rising up to prove to us that our instruction has been a great success. The Christian nations must reap what the Christian generals have sown. It is only the good seed that is sown in tears and reaped in joy; the bad seed is sown in joy and reaped in tears. And the seed of war is bad seed.

"Perhaps we think that the Chinese have no right to squirm or kick, but if Germany came over here and took possession of Boston harbor and Boston town, would we squirm? If Italy laid hold of New Orleans, because a mob killed a lot of Italians, would it jar us? If China knocked down the Golden Gate and chased some Californians into the woods for mobbing their people, would we wriggle? If Great Britain asked us to give up the Mississippi Valley would

we smile? If Salisbury put a man in Washington to collect our revenue, would we get down on our knees to thank him? If somebody got awfully hurt for this kind of business, how would we divide up the blame? Perhaps the Chinaman should not have any nerve centers; but what if he has? And perhaps there are so many of them that a lot of them could be used for bait and hardly missed; but suppose that they object?"

The writer seeks not to defend China in any wrong. But surely the oldest empire in the world is deserving of more consideration and respect than Christian nations are wont to show to it. Let China be punished so far as she deserves it; but let our punishment be just. Who is to blame? That is the question. We wish to teach those backward, superstitious people of the celestial empire, that the introduction of modern inventions—plows, engines, electric light, education etc., are not their enemies but their benefactors. But to do this by force is to prove ourselves untrue to the principles of Jesus. "China for the Chinese" is just as reasonable and Christian a motto as "America for the Americans."

Germany has used her missionaries in China for the extension of the German Empire rather than the Kingdom of God. The same Kaiser who lent his sanction to the cruel murder of Armenians is now interposing in behalf of the

murdered missionaries in China! This is contemptible hypocrisy! Any ruler who could give such bloodthirsty advice to his departing soldiers cannot have any heart-felt interest in the missionaries of Christ. O how zealously the irreligious will defend religion when it can be made to foster a selfish purpose! O how France and Germany do love her foreign missionaries—*at times!* Not a single war that has ever been waged against China by the Christian nations can be justified at the bar of human justice.

Fifth: the Christian press. We are not surprised when we see the daily press, especially the "yellow press," lend its sanction to war and indulge in the sentiments of hostility. But when the Christian press descends to such a low plane, the sad fact is to be deplored. Quite often the Christian press is colored with war-tales, illustrations from war, and even quite long stories of famous battle-fields, out of which the editor attempts to bring forth some moral lesson. Of course there are some worthy examples of heroic courage and self-sacrifice; but coming as they do out of such wholesale slaughter of human life, the morals are lost sight of, and only the horrors which crowd them out, remain. A clergyman of more than national reputation, and editor of one of the most influential Christian papers in this country, has recently made use of Jesus' example in driving

buyers and sellers out of the temple as an argument for resorting to arms! Another religious paper has recently printed, above the initials "C. S. H." the following:

"Now I want to introduce Christ as the great Commander-in-Chief. We are not to 'know Christ after the flesh any more.' He is through with His sacrificial work; no longer the Lamb, but the 'Lion of the tribe of Judah.' John, who knew Him as the Meek and Lowly, was overwhelmed with awe as he beheld Him in His imperial majesty. When He laid the foundation of His new nation He was non-resistant, and enjoined His followers to be. He did not wish to wake up a tribe of anarchists. He had a sacrificial life, so had His Church in those first centuries of blood. Paul made a distinction between his work as a servant of Christ, for he took his stonings and scourgings without lawsuits; but he did several times assert the dignity of his Roman citizenship, and he foreshadowed the time when saints should judge the world. Nowhere are nations commanded to be non-resistant against wrong.

"Read carefully the second Psalm. How wonderful! When nations despise the Lord and His anointed, and propose to break their bonds in sunder, and cast their cords from them, then they are to be broken with a rod of iron and dashed in pieces as a potter's vessel. The second Psalm, the 110th also, and Revelation,

give us an introduction to the imperial Jesus. 'He that overcometh and keepeth My works to the end, to him will I give power over the nations, and he shall rule them with a rod of iron, and as vessels of a potter shall they be broken to shivers, even as I receive of my Father.' This refers back to God's warranty deed of the nations in the second Psalm.

Revelation 19:11–16 reveals to us the Christ of to-day. 'And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse, and He that sat upon him is called Faithful and True, and in righteousness doth He judge and make war. And He is clothed in a vesture dipped in blood, and His name is called the Word of God.' We cannot mistake the person. 'And out of His mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it He should smite the nations, and He shall rule them with a rod of iron; and He treadeth the wine-press of the fierceness of the wrath of Almighty God. And he hath on His vesture and on His thigh a name written: King of Kings and Lord of Lords.'

"Now when I look at this glorious and imperial One, I feel that He is at the helm, and I rejoice in our growing army and navy. I glory in our banner and realize that our Great Commander-in-Chief is righteous, and just, and mighty, and the nations are in His hands. War is often inevitable. It must come, it will come. We cannot stop to count the cost when we are

carrying out the plans of God. His is a kingdom of power."

Such statements are not only non-Christian, they are untrue. They show a low condition of of intellectual, not to say Christian life. When one reads in a Christian paper about the "Imperial Jesus," riding through the streets of heaven on a "white horse" to smite the nations and "rule them with a rod of iron, clothed in a vesture dipped in blood, a sharp sword going forth out of His mouth." he feels constrained to inquire whether the editor has opened his columns to some savage in the jungle. Such a caricature on the "Prince of Peace" is little short of blasphemy.

Some men have been great in war, but as the years roll on we see that they were infinitely greater in peace. In the annals of French history no name shines in greater radiance than that of St. Louis. For his noble sense of justice, his high regard for the rights of others, his fatherly affection for his people and his deep interests in warfare and happiness, he will be remembered when the name of Napoleon shall have been forgotten. But the noblest achievement of his life, and the thing which will serve to keep his memory green for all time, is the fact that he used all his royal power and best influence for the abolition of that most cruel, unjust and "impious trial by battle" When does our own Washington appear before us at

his noblest and greatest? Not when he is mounted on a foaming steed of war, nor even when he is struggling to cross the Delaware on his way to the capture of Trenton, nor compelling Cornwallis to surrender, but we behold him in his true greatness refusing a kingly crown, urging a peaceful neutrality and refusing to adhere to the demands of the people who clamor for war.

When does William Penn appear at his greatest, when does he rise to angelic stature and seem like a god? When he is establishing the law of love with his fellow men. "To William Penn belongs the distinction destined to brighten as man advances in virtue, of first in human history establishing the law of love as a rule of conduct in the intercourse of nations. His serene countenence as he stands with his followers in what he calls 'the sweet air of Pennsylvania,' all unarmed, beneath the spreading elm, entering into the great treaty of friendship with the Indians, whose savage display fills the forest around as far as eye can reach—not to wrest their lands by violence but to obtain them by peaceful purchase—to my mind is the proudest picture in the history of our country. 'The great God,' said the illustrious Quaker, 'hath written His law in our hearts by which we are taught and commanded to love and help and do good to one another. It is not our custom to use hostile weapons against our fellow

creatures, for which reason we are unarmed; our object is not to do injury but to do good. We are now met in the broad path of good faith, and good will, so that no advantage is to be taken on either side, but all is to be openness, brotherhood and love, while all are to be treated as the same flesh and blood. Without any carnal weapons we enter the land, and abide therein as if there had been thousands of garrisons. Greater than the divinity that doth hedge a king is the divinity that encompasses a righteous man and a righteous people.' "*

The flowers of prosperity delight to grow in the footprints of William Penn. His people were unmolested and happy, while other colonies, acting upon the policy of the world, building forts and showing themselves in arms, were harrassed by perpetual alarm, and pierced by the sharp arrows of savage warriors.

This pattern of a Christian commonwealth never fails to arrest the admiration of all who contemplate its beauty. So even it has been eulogized by the caustic pen of Voltaire. Every ingenious soul in our day offers a willing tribute to those graces of justice and humanity by the side of which contemporary life, in this continent, seems coarse and earthly.

Jesus Himself, in His practise of non-resistance reveals the grandest and noblest type of the true hero. Never does He seem more like

* True Grandeur of a Nation.

God than when He declines to talk back, or strike back; even to permit others to do so in His behalf. It is those withheld blows of Jesus that are now breaking the world's hard heart. When society was brutal, when men's highest ambition was to destroy their fellow men, when prisoners dwelt in palaces and robbers congregated by the wayside, when all manner of instruments of torture that hell itself could suggest were being invented and employed by man to inflict pain upon his fellow man, when the finest works of art—the treasures of the art-loving world—were being destroyed by the enemies of each other, Jesus came forth uttering those strange words, "Peace on earth, good-will to men"; "Love your enemies"; "Blessed are the peace-makers"; "I came not to destroy"; He raised no mailed hand to smite, He drew no sword, He went about doing good. The feet that ran on errands of mercy, the hands that were never lifted but to bless, were nailed to a cross of wood, and He offered no resistance against this cruelty, although He might have summoned the armies of the world and the hosts of heaven to His defense. But His is the greater triumph —the triumph of non-resistance. His sword is the sword of the Spirit, His shield the breast-plate of truth and righteousness; His victory is the victory of peace, and once more we can truly say: "Thou hast conquered, O Galileean!" His words are coming literally to pass—"They

that take the sword shall perish by the sword." This is literally true of individuals. Those who resort to force will sooner or later perish by that force. The persecutor injures himself more than the one whom he persecutes; the slanderer wakes up at last to behold that all the while he has been painting his own picture for the world to gaze at. Every blow rebounds in destructive reaction, and every evil word returns to distil a deadly poison at the source whence it started. The man who is most often seen in courts of law is least often at the throne of grace. And the nation that takes the sword shall perish by the sword. A glance into history proves the literal truth of this great principle. It is a law of God. Strike nature and nature strikes back. Egypt took the sword and by the sword she perished. Persia took the sword and has perished by it. Babylon took the sword and by the sword she also perished. Greece did the same, with the same result. Rome resorted to brute force, and that cruelty turned at last upon her own wicked head. The same is true of Spain. Turkey has taken the sword and by the sword she has perished; as a nation she has no respect; her name has become a symbol for cruelty; she stands as a hissing and a by-word among the most respectable nations of the earth. On the contrary, those whom she has persecuted and treated so cruelly are already rising in their might, and will yet

rise up into a great, strong, peace-loving people with the whole world as their protector and benefactor.

My opponent pictured the danger of a nation like England disarming, while she is surrounded by jealous powers who are watching and even anxious for her downfall. "Supposing," he said, "England should disarm, surrounded as she is by nations who still retain the old jealousies and enmities of the past; how quickly would they leap from ambush to divide the spoils." Would not the very opposite result come to pass? Suppose for instance, that a great nation like England would rise in the strength of all that is noblest and best, and place the other nations upon their manhood and their honor; supposing England should say to the world: "We have decided to trust you; therefore we disarm. If ever we have taken anything that was not our due, we cheerfully restore it; we ask the forgiveness of those nations to whom we have been overbearing and that we have ill-treated in any way: our highest ambition henceforth shall be to bless and help all nations, to make any sacrifice in the interest of humanity, to seek our own good by seeking the good of others and to find our highest and richest blessings in striving to be a blessing to others. This we do as a Christian nation, upon the basis of the teachings and of the spirit of the Prince of Peace and the King of kings; to

this end and for this cause we are willing, if need be, to lose our national existence and to lay down our life." No nation would then rise against England; but all of the nations would rally around her in a union of peace and good-will, such as the world has never seen.

I have tried in justice to apportion the blame. I have placed most of the blame where I honestly believe it belongs—upon the Church, the ministry and press. Their approval of war is contrary to the spirit and teaching of Jesus. This great preparation for war in the time of peace to which the Church and ministry always lends its approval, breathes a lack of faith in man and trust in God. On this point Dr. Parkhurst speaks truly:

"If Jesus had gone armed it would have been a confession on His part that the brute force of the visible world is more than a match for the spiritual power of the invisible world. You cannot make a man believe in God if you do not convince him that you believe in Him yourself. Peter, by brandishing his sword, denied the divinity of Jesus; and any other man cheapens God when he goes about to yoke God's Spirit alongside of carnal contrivances. It is the absence of such carnal contrivances that explains the rapid extension of Christianity during the first three centuries of our own era. God worked mightily because He had no backing, up to that time. Armies and navies were on the

side of the pagans. Christianity is never so safe and so powerful as when it is unprotected and the evangelization that depends for its good results upon soldiers and gun-boats has no future."*

Jesus' custom is to emphasize the good. He believed thoroughly in man because He believed in God. He is truly optimistic. He believed in the ultimate triumph of the good. To Him evil was a negation, something to be destroyed. He loved the people in spite of their sins, and His pure soul detected the good in the midst of bad. He pitied people in their weakness; and, knowing the cause of this weakness, He loved them none the less. There is good enough in the world to-day to counteract the bad, if only it can be focalized and applied in a whole-hearted manner. There is enough of the Christ-spirit in man to triumph over the satanic spirit and send it to its own place.

It is not a new or a different organization which the world needs, but more of the disposition and the Christ life in the minds of men. No new organization in the Christian Church is necessary in order to protest against the evils of war; we have too many organizations now. But let every Church that bears the name of Christ reunite in His name for the promotion of peace on earth and good-will to men. That church-member is not Christ's disciple who is

*Charles H. Parkhurst.

still willing to do military service and take up arms against his fellow man. That Church, whatever else it may be called, is not the Church of Christ, which lends its sanction to a bloody, unchristlike war, or which will in any degree lend aid or approval to it. And that nation cannot be called Christian which takes up arms against another nation. Only those who do Christ's will are really His and only those who are His by the doing of His will and the living of His life should dare to lay claim to the name of Christian.

XIV

THE ULTIMATE TRIBUNAL

The necessity of absolute obedience to the supreme source of authority is my final plea. Such a source of authority must needs be authority which is more than human—righteous, supreme and final. If such source of authority were not available to mankind, the universal demand for it, which makes itself felt in the consciousness of the world's deep need, would bring such authority into being. But this is just what has come to pass. The true source of authority does really exist and is even now available. It does not need to be discovered or rediscovered, only acknowledged. The Divine Arbiter is here; He has spoken, and His word is final. Different plans for a Court of Arbitration have appeared in print from time to time, and some of these have actually been subjected to the actual test. The spirit which prompts such an organization is good; it is Christian and therefore commendable. But not one of these has met with universal approval; not one of them would be accepted and adopted by all nations to-day. No form of arbitration created in the councils of men will ever meet with the approval of all mankind; it cannot be so, from the nature of the case. The old astronomers

could put the earth at the center of the solar system, but they could not make the other heavenly bodies move in harmony around it. Such a center, however beautiful it may have seemed in theory, could not result in the harmonious movement of the vast system. There was only one natural and perfect center; but there was one, and that was quite sufficient. Its power and fitness to take its place as the center did not need to be discovered, only acknowledged. Its light and beauty had long shone upon the world, but men were blind alike to both; its power had long controlled other worlds, but men were ignorant of that as well. Men rejoiced in the light, although ignorant of the source whence it came. At last the sun found its natural center, not in the heavens where it had always been, but in the benighted mind of man, and then disorder and confusion, which existed nowhere else, immediately disappeared; thus harmony took the place of confusion, and order sprang out of chaos, and then it was discovered that no disorder or confusion had ever existed amid the handiwork of God, but in the crude, ignorant intellect and in the benighted soul of mankind. Likewise, the center and source of all final authority in all human affairs is Christ; where this authority is acknowledged, all is harmony and peace; where it is ignored, all is discord, confusion and despair.

This truth is beautifully illustrated in individual lives. Those who walk in His footsteps, those who do His will, those who obey His precepts, those lives that are truly patterned after Him, are harmonious, peaceful, charitable, philanthropic, broad, generous, tolerant, forbearing, forgiving, and fruitful of all that is good and sweet and precious in the world. The same is true of organizations. The Church, like the individual, which recognizes Christ as its center, has harmony, peace and power. But the Church or organization, like the individual, which makes the world its center, must expect to have disorder, confusion and misery. No Court of Arbitration can ever avail to bring this discordant world into unity, harmony and peace, that is not Christo-centric. If the authority of the Christ who has appeared is not sufficient for this all-important purpose, then a greater than He must necessarily come. But according to His own testimony no higher authority is possible. He said: "I and My Father are one; He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father." Either His authority is supreme in all things, or it is useless and of no consequence anywhere. How far do His own claims harmonize with the inspired prophecies concerning Him?

Let us examine the declaration of the Divine Word and see. "By Him were all things made, and without Him was not anything made

that was made." "He was before all things, and by Him do all things consist." Earthly rulers are warned not to set themselves "against the Lord and against His anointed, lest they be dashed in pieces like a potter's vessel." He is the One by whom "kings rule and princes decree judgment." According to the words of the dying Jacob, "Unto Him shall the gathering of all peoples be"; and the prophet Isaiah declares: "The government shall be upon His shoulders and His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, Prince of Peace."

These prophecies are being literally fulfilled. They have been reproduced and verified by the greatest lives, even down to the present time.

The tributes which great minds have paid to His personal character even surpass those which they have paid to His genius. Renan speaks of Him as "One whose beauty is eternal and whose reign shall never end." Again he declares: "His worship will grow young without ceasing; His history will call forth tears without end, while coming ages will declare that among the sons of men there is none born greater than Jesus." Carlyle declares: "The tidings of the life and death of the divine Man of Judea the most important event ever transacted in the world." Matthew Arnold says: "Christ came to reveal what real righteousness is, for nothing will do except righteousness and

no other conception of righteousness will do except Christ's conception of it." "The world has changed," says Martineau, "and that change is chiefly due to Christ."

Therefore, according to the voice of prophecy and the testimony of the wisest and best minds in all ages, Christ's authority is supreme. And if He is supreme, all else must be subordinate. Supremacy implies subordination, and sovereignty necessitates submission. There can be but one central sun. Every other orb must move around it in obedience to it. There can be only one supreme central power in the world of human activity, but one there must be, and its power must be acknowledged and obeyed. We find such power complete in Him, of whom it was declared that "righteousness shall be the girdle of His loins and faithfulness the girdle of His reins."

As to the best form for such a Court of Arbitration to assume or the number of persons composing it and what nations shall be represented in it, the writer feels unqualified to determine. This, however, is of secondary importance. Acknowledge the center and the system will arrange itself in natural and perfect order around it. I do not care how many nations shall be represented. It may be part or all of them. I am not especially concerned in regard to the numbers which shall constitute the world's Court of Arbitration. The color,

name or nationality, will not figure in this problem. The principal point, and in fact the only one for which I contend, is that it shall be conducted according to the principles of Jesus' teaching as stated in the New Testament. However indefinite His instruction may seem in certain cases to be, in the book of Matthew it is plain and explicit. These instructions, I know, have been restricted to Church affairs, but the Master did not intend that they should be so restricted. No such limitation should be placed upon them; they should be applied in all cases, to all nations and by all mankind. Let us consider these teachings and their relations to national difficulties. If they can be applied effectually to individual cases, they will apply equally well to national affairs, for the nations are only aggregations of individuals. The true principles as set forth in Jesus' teachings are negotiation, meditation and arbitration.

I. Negotiation. "If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother." Individuals do sometimes offend against one another, but no good sensible persons will ever resort to brute force as a means of redress. Their method of settling these disputes, the degree of self-control and forbearance which they manifest, will always determine the character of the men.

And nations sometimes disagree. Disturbing questions are continually arising. How are these to be settled? The method of settlement employed will likewise reveal the character of the contending nations. If they settle according to Christ's methods, then are they like Christ and may properly be called Christian nations. But if they resort to brute force they do thereby exhibit their weakness and their grotesqueness to the world. Their example to other nations is deplorable. Likewise two men are at variance for whatever cause. What is their duty? As Christians their duty is plain. One should approach the other in friendly intercourse; but which one? Who is to take the initiative? Whoever is great enough to realize that a wrong has been committed, a wrong which is injurious, not only to the parties directly concerned, but also to the harmony and peace of the cause which they represent; he should approach the other in the manner described. He may have committed the wrong, he may be the one against whom the wrong has been committed, it makes no difference, his duty is practically the same. This method may result in peace and friendship; it often does so result, and the friendship is deeper and sweeter than before. "If he will hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother." If he will not hear, however, then he is clearly in the wrong. But though he should thus prove to be obstinate, the duty of him who would make

peace is not therefore done. He must revisit his obstinate brother in company with one or two others. This is mediation. Should this step prove of no effect, then is he at liberty to tell the matter to the organization of which they are members. It may be the Church or some other organization—the principle is the same. Such organization shall then use all legitimate means for the purpose of bringing the offender to repentance, to the end that he may be reclaimed. Should this method fail, then must public opinion frown upon him. He must be regarded as an outcast, unreasonable, unjust, and therefore unfit to be a member of any decent society. This is his punishment and it may prove to be greater than he can bear. It often does. But no resort to force is permitted.

Some nation offends some other nation. What is the duty of the nation whose pride is wounded? The principle is exactly the same. Let the recognized rulers of those nations do all in their power to restore friendship and peace. This is negotiation. If this fails, let them go to the offender in company with others chosen for such purpose. This is mediation. Should this fail, they can then report to the great tribunal, whose central figure is the Prince of Peace. But there the matter must end, there must be no resort to arms. The nation that still persists should be considered an outcast,

unjust, unreasonable, cruel, and therefore unworthy the confidence and respect of all self-respecting nations of the world. No nation under such conditions can live and prosper. It would be a natural impossibility that it should do so. The branch cannot live severed from the vine. But supposing that a certain nation feels conscious of having been wronged? But its consciousness is contrary to the best judgment of an impartial tribunal, which has acted so far as possible upon the righteous principles of the highest authority, which is Christ's. No true individual will desire to be of a selfish, obstinate or grasping disposition. He should not desire to take from another that which he believes to be for his own selfish advantage, at the expense of another's loss. Over what do the nations most often quarrel? Usually territory. The one desires what the other claims. Here Christ's words to the complaining brother are in point: "beware of covetousness." O! if the nations would only heed this important command, war would soon disappear, for the cause out of which it springs would vanish. Covetousness has been the cause of many an unholy war—possibly all of them. Covetousness is the great mistake of all nations to-day. If only they would seek each other's good they would the better promote their own. "In honor preferring one another," they would best exalt themselves. The dead nations are those which have lived

unto self. The nation that shall begin to live for other nations shall begin to live forever. This is God's law which we observed in nature, acting also upon the nations of the earth. By helping others rise they also rise, to power, dominion and glory. By giving unto others they receive from others infinitely more than they give; by blessing others they also are abundantly blessed; by dying for others they live to die no more. But that nation is already dead and buried beneath the ruins of those whom it has crushed.

It is no small cause for rejoicing to know that the multitudes are coming to recognize and to act upon this great, unerring principle. Every true Christian should begin at once to act upon these true principles of Jesus, by practising the great law of non-resistance. This is the kind of revival that the world most needs. Let it re-begin in the Christian Church. Let the Church become Christian indeed; let every Christian decide thus: "God helping me, I will endeavor to practise non-resistance according to the example of Jesus. I will return good for evil; I will lay down my life for the good of others, by consecrating every power of my being to the building up of my fellow men, and I will abstain from everything, in thought, word and deed, that would in any way make for their injury. I will strive to cherish the same love for other nations that I do for my own, and I will never

take up arms against a sister nation or a fellow being."

This blessed condition is coming. Already it has come in many noble, Christlike lives. The new day is dawning. Mine eyes have seen the beauty of the coming of its beams. Already grace and truth have met together, righteousness and peace have kissed each other. Righteousness is springing out of the earth and joy is looking down from heaven.

"For I dipt into the future, far as human eye could see,
Saw the Vision of the world, and all the wonders that would be;
Saw the heavens filled with commerce, argosies of magic sails,
Pilots in the purple twilight, dropping down their costly bales,
Heard the heavens filled with shouting, and there rain'd a ghastly dew
From the nations' airy navies, grappling in the central blue;

* * * * * * *

Till the war-drum throbbed no longer, and the battle-flags were furl'd
In the Parliament of man, the Federation of the world." *

* Tennyson: Locksley Hall.

date due

DATE DUE

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN JX1953.M3 1900
MacLaren, Jam Put up thy sword :
3 0645 0005 0974 1